DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 744 CE 040 757

TITLE	Job Corps Amendments of 1984. Hearing before the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-Eighth Congress, Second Session on S. 2111, to Amend Part B of Title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act, to Strengthen the Job Corps Program.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	S-Hrg-98-1153
PUB DATE	8 Feb 84
NOTE	175p.; Document contains small type.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; Disadvantaged Youth; *Dropout Programs; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Cooperation; Educational Equipment; Educational Facilities; *Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Evaluation Criteria; *Federal Legislation; Financial Needs; Financial Support; *Job Training; Policy Formation; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Policy; Rehabilitation Programs; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Amendments; Congress 98th; Department of Labor; *Job Corps; Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Private Sector

ABSTRACT

This Congressional report contains testimony pertaining to amending the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to strengthen the Job Corps Program. The primary focus of the hearing was on the current adequacy and future potential of the Job Corps' vocational and basic education programs, facilities and equipment, residential living and enrichment programs, as well as the adequacy of the Department of Labor's budget and personnel resources to achieve Job Corps' goals. Included among those persons providing testimony at the hearing were representatives of the following agencies and organizations: Teledyne Economic Development Company; Management and Training Corporation; the National Football League Players Association; Minact, Inc.; and the Singer Company. A Job Corps vocational review and a memorandum from Peter E. Rell, the director of the Office of Job Corps, concerning establishment of performance standards for Job Corps Centers are also provided in the text of the hearing. Statements were also presented by Patrick J. O'Keefe, of the U.S. Department of Labor, and by Jennings Randolph, a U.S. Senator from West Virginia. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CE

ED253744

S. Hrg. 98-1153

JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS OF 1984

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2111

TO AMEND PART B OF TITLE IV OF THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP
ACT, TO STRENGTHEN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

FEBRUARY 8, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
40-051 O WASHINGTON : 1984

CE040757

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Michigan
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut

Ronald F. Docksai, *Staff Director*
Kathryn O'L. Higgins, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1984

Page

Gaines, John, president, Teledyne Economic Development Co., Los Angeles, CA 134
  Prepared statement 137
Marquardt, Robert L., chairman and president, Management and Training Corp., Ogden, UT 150
  Prepared statement 153
National Football League Players Association [NFLPA], prepared statement ... 168
O'Keefe, Patrick J., Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training, Department of Labor 6
  Prepared statement 7
Randolph, Hon. Jennings, a U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia 2
  Prepared statement 5
Simmons, O.H., corporate secretary, Minact, Inc., Jackson, MS 126
  Prepared statement 128
Watkins, Herb W., vice president and general manager, the Singer Co., career system, Rochester, NY 145
  Prepared statement 148
Articles, publications, etc.:
  Job Corps vocational review 16
  Establishment of performance standards for Job Corps Centers, from Peter E. Rell, Director, Office of Job Corps 74

JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS OF 1984

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1984

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:15 a.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Orrin Hatch (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Hatch, Hawkins, and Randolph.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HATCH

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to welcome everyone to our hearing this morning to examine the U.S. Job Corps Program. During this morning's hearing we will assess the program's needs, its administration, and what I believe to be its potential.

First established in 1965, the Job Corps currently serves 40,000 young men and women per year between the ages of 16 and 21. It provides education, occupational skills training, residential and counseling services to economically disadvantaged youth who have dropped out of school, who are doomed to hang out on street corners, in bars, or with gangs, or who have turned to drugs, alcohol, and to criminal activity. These young people have been disillusioned by the traditional school system and they have experienced rejection and failure. Their decision to drop out of school compounds these feelings of failure and locks them into an antisocial, unproductive, and emotionally crippling way of life. These young people waste their potential and their futures. The Job Corps provides an effective way out of the personal stagnation caused by poverty and lack of education.

Since its beginning 16 years ago, the Job Corps has recognized and successfully targeted its efforts on this group of youth which other institutions are tempted to writeoff. By giving these young people a practical way to overcome their disadvantaged past, the Job Corps motivates these youth to value independence, education, hard work, and self-esteem instead of drug or alcohol addiction, welfare dependence, illiteracy, and defeatism.

In fiscal year 1983, 50 percent of all enrollees in Job Corps obtained jobs or successfully enlisted in the military. In addition, 25 percent pursued advanced educational or vocational training. This adds up to an impressive 75 percent positive termination rate.

We should not, however, overlook areas for improvement in the Job Corps Program. Our hearing this morning will focus on the current adequacy and future potential of Job Corps' vocational and basic education programs, facilities and equipment, residential living and enrichment programs, as well as the adequacy of the Department of Labor's budget and personnel resources to achieve Job Corps' goals.

Those of us who are committed to the Job Corps Program are also obligated to address its ongoing needs and to corrent immediately those problems that may endanger student safety and health, learning ability, or the development of a positive attitude through a positive milieu. Several specific proposals to improve the Job Corps' operation are spelled out in the bill I introduced earlier this year, S. 2111, legislation for Job Corps reform.

These major issues should be addressed by Congress to ensure the present and future effectiveness of the Job Corps as a tool for mainstreaming these disadvantaged black youth and minority youth and minority women, as well as others, into society as productive citizens. Of course, the Job Corps has been, and still is, a team effort. This is why I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the U.S. Department of Labor for its willingness to work with this committee.

I also wish to express my admiration and appreciation to Bob Marquardt and others working with him, here representing the Management and Training Corp. of Ogden, UT. I believe most would agree that its Clearfield Job Corps Center is very exemplary.

Together, we can take the necessary action to improve the operation of the Job Corps for the benefit of young people who have nowhere to go but upward and onward.

My personal commitment to Job Corps does not outweigh the fact that I think there are things that are wrong, that there are things that need to be improved, that there are reforms that need to be made, and that is true of every entity of Government. It is not just limited to the Job Corps.

I would not be doing my job as the chairman of this committee if I were not interested in helping the Job Corps to be the absolutely best organization it can possibly be.

I think many efforts are being made voluntarily in both the private and public sectors to actually accomplish that.

I personally appreciate the witnesses taking time to be here this morning.

We will turn right now to our distinguished Senator from West Virginia and dear colleague, Senator Randolph.

STATEMENT OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator RANDOLPH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

It is a privilege and a responsibility to join with you and others as we examine very carefully the Job Corps Program. Hopefully we shall make constructive suggestions in today's dialog between witnesses and members of this committee.

I am strongly supportive of this effort which provides training in vocational skills, for disadvantaged—young people who are 14 to 21 years of age.

The residential centers across America provide outstanding environments in which young people learn and grow. In addition, many worthwhile community projects are completed by the participants as they learn skills and work habits, which they can and do translate into productive jobs later in their lives.

Of course, it is natural that I would be more familiar with the Job Corps Program and activities in West Virginia than in other parts of the country. We have two residential centers in our State. One is at the State capital in Charleston, and the other is in historic Harpers Ferry, the extreme point of what we call the eastern panhandle of West Virginia.

We have recruitment programs which are being carried forward in towns and communities, both large and small across the entire State.

The success of the Job Corps in West Virginia has been demonstrated over and over. There are thousands—and I underscore the word "thousands"—of young people who have been helped by the Job Corps. Those stories, I hope through the action of this committee and the Congress, will continue.

The West Virginia Job Corps Centers provide training for a very wide range of skills. We are fortunate that our two centers in West Virginia offer a variety of experiences. These Job Corps facilities have enrollments in West Virginia at the present time of 650 youth. I will call them students. I will call them workers. I will call them, very proudly, young people in the process of learning.

The Job Corps at Charleston is the second oldest in the United States of America. It will be 20 years of age on June 6, 1985, and is at the present time serving more than 400 individuals. I had the opportunity of attending the dedication of the Charleston Center when it was established.

This Center is operated by the Management and Training Corporation, located in a State that our chairman thinks well of, the State of Utah. As I think of this Ogden-based management firm and what it has done, I am pleased.

I have recently received an informative magazine from the Clearfield Job Corps Center in Utah. I learned much about the operation of that facility, which is also operated by the management and training corp.

The magazine is not printed with Federal funds. I think it is important to make that statement. You naturally wonder, where does it get its support? It is supported entirely by local advertising.

We are anxiously awaiting the publication of a comparable magazine about the Charleston Center. That would begin in April. Already we are gratified to report to this committee hearing that there are over 90 citizens on the local community relations council for the Job Corps Center in Charleston who have put in money to pay for a full page ad each month. It is this type of community support that has been the hallmark of Job Corps over the years.

Our second Center in West Virginia, the Harpers Ferry Center, is one of 30 Civilian Conservation Corps Centers. It is operated by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

I think we have some disagreement today of where these programs should be located. I believe the programs within the Department of the Interior are well managed, and I think we should give careful attention to continuing at least some centers under that Federal agency.

I feel very kindly toward Job Corps because, without my knowledge, they constructed a bridge and they named it in my memory.

The CHAIRMAN. I always wondered about you, Senator.

Senator RANDOLPH. I remember I took a high hat and wore it as I marched across that bridge at Harpers Ferry, where once, in the waters below, we had a factory that turned out guns. This was not in the war between the States but in the beginning years when Harpers Ferry was an important entry point to the West.

I must be forgiven, also, for saying that I may put in the record what Thomas Jefferson said about the beauty of that part of West Virginia. I think I will do that. May I have the privilege of quoting——

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly may.

Senator RANDOLPH [continuing]. From Thomas Jefferson?

[The quotation referred to follows:]

THOMAS JEFFERSON ON HARPER'S FERRY

In 1781, Thomas Jefferson, who later became the third President of the United States, wrote of the majesty and grandeur of the scenery at Harper's Ferry:

"The passage of the Potomac through the Blue Ridge is, perhaps, one of the most stupendous scenes in nature, and worthy of a trip across the Atlantic."

Senator RANDOLPH. I remember—when I proposed the creation of the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. Now that was back in 1944, that period of time. I have the opportunity now to speak of what we have done there. We had last year 1 million visitors, Mr. Chairman, to the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park. The restorations there are worth the visit of many people to that area; not only those of West Virginia, but also those of the nearby areas. Harper's Ferry is approximately 1 hour to the west of Washington, DC.

Only employing a few people in the beginning, we have now the employment of approximately 450 men and women directly and indirectly at the park. We have the Mather Training Center, named after Mr. Mather who was the first Director of the Park Service in this country. We have the Design Center which provides help to all of the parks of the United States of America. We have the training programs for personnel that go across this Nation in our parks.

Then, of course, the Harpers Ferry Park itself is a place of information and joy to visit. We have had the help of the Job Corps in many, many such worthwhile programs.

Harpers Ferry, I repeat, it is 1 of 30 Civilian Conservation Corps Centers. It is operated by the Interior Department. I am not sure why you wish to relocate these centers, Mr. Chairman, and to have them placed in one or two other agencies, but I am sure you have good reason. That would be a matter for discussion.

We are currently operating in excess of its capacity of 210 youth.

The Center at Harpers Ferry has provided not only training, but educational facilities for thousands—not hundreds, but thousands—of young people. These projects, forgetting the bridge across the stream, are constructive projects. The communities nearby are helped by this Job Corps. The Job Corps Program is a success in West Virginia.

However, I do want to hear the discussion from the witnesses and, if there are needs for reform and changes with the Job Corps format, I would certainly be listening very carefully and hope to be cooperative in that respect.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Randolph follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR RANDOLPH

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to join you this morning as we examine the Job Corps Program. I am strongly supportive of this effective program to provide vocational skills training for disadvantaged young people aged 14 to 21.

The residential centers across the nation provide outstanding environments for young people to learn and grow; in addition, many worthwhile community projects are completed by the participants as they learn skills and work habits which they are able to translate into productive jobs later.

Of course, I am most familiar with the Job Corps activities in West Virginia. We have 2 residential centers, in Charleston and in Harpers Ferry, but we have recruitment taking place in towns and communities acorss the State.

The success of the Job Corps in West Virginia has been demonstrated time and again. There are thousands of young people who have been helped by the Job Corps, and I want those success stories to continue.

The West Virginia Job Corps centers provide a wide range of skills training and we are fortunate that our two centers in West Virginia offer a variety of experiences. Together, the two West Virginia Job Corps facilities have enrollments totalling more than 650 students.

The Charleston Job Corps center is the second oldest center in the nation; it will be twenty years old June 6, 1985 and is currently serving more than 400 students. The center is operated by the Mangagement and Training Corporation of Ogden, Utah, and I have recently received an informative magazine from the Clearfield Center in Utah which is also operated by the Management and Training Corporation. The magazine is not printed with government funds, but is supported entirely by local advertising. We are anxiously waiting for the publication of a comparable magazine about the Charleston center to begin in April. Already over 90 citizens on the local community relations council for the Job Corps center in Charleston have put in money to pay for a full page ad each month. It is this kind of community support that has been the hallmark of Job Corps over the years.

Our second center in West Virginia, the Harpers Ferry Job Corps center is one of 30 Civilian Conservation Corps Centers. It is operated by the Department of the Interior. Our Harpers Ferry center is currently operating in excess of its capacity of 210, now serving 224 young people. Over the years, the Harpers Ferry Center has provided education and training for thousands of young people, as well as provided many constructive projects for the community.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on about the successes of the Job Corps in West Virginia, but I am anxious to hear our witnesses this morning and to review your legislation for reform of this program.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator. We appreciate your comments.

We will begin our hearings this morning by calling Patrick J. O'Keefe, of the Department of Labor, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training.

We are very happy to have you with us.

Let me just say this: I would appreciate it if all witnesses would summarize their testimonies. We will just state at the beginning of the hearing that we will put the complete testimony of all witnesses into the hearing record as though fully delivered. That will enable us to have more time for questions.

I have to be to the Rules Committee by 11 o'clock, so I am a little bit concerned about getting through this hearing.

We will turn to you, Mr. O'Keefe, and take your testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF PATRICK J. O'KEEFE, ACTING DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. O'KEEFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you requested, I will just make a few key points and submit for the record our formal statement.

As the committee and you certainly know, Mr. Chairman, the Job Corps is a unique training and employment initiative. As a profile of the average Corps member displays that we are submitting for the record, it is directed toward the most severely handicapped youth.

To prepare these youth for the labor market, the program provides Corps members with a broad array of services. As a result, the Job Corps is also an expensive program. We are submitting for the record a historical summary of the cost of the Job Corps.

Through several measures over the past several years, we have been able to restrain the cost increases in this program and, in fact, in real terms the costs of the program have been going down somewhat.

For fiscal year 1985, our budget proposes $600 million for the Job Corps. At this level of funding, we will be able to maintain the current capacity of the program; that is, 40,544 service years. This will require further efficiencies, however.

Over the past 3 years we have directed considerable attention to improving the administration and management of the program and correcting several problems that existed when the administration first came into office.

For a brief illustration, we have over the past 3 years instituted new procedures to assure the proper reporting and handling of significant incidents. We have revised the procurement system. We have improved the program's budget and financial management systems. We have recently completed an assessment of all vocational training programs the Job Corps offers and we have developed program performance standards which will be coming on line next spring.

Like you, Mr. Chairman, we recognize that additional improvements are necessary, and a major priority of ours in the coming months will be the development and implementation of a system for identifying and addressing facilities needs.

Mr. Chairman, you and the committee are to be congratulated for undertaking this timely examination of the Job Corps. We are now happy to respond to any questions that you or other members of the committee have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. O'Keefe follows:]

TESTIMONY OF PATRICK J. O'KEEFE
ACTING DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR
FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

FEBRUARY 8, 1984

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the invitation to appear before you to review the Job Corps program and the measures that we are taking to improve it. With me today are Roberts T. Jones, Administrator of our Comprehensive Employment and Training Office and Peter Rell, Director of the Job Corps Office.

Like all training and employment programs, the Job Corps is committed to increasing the employment and earnings of those it serves. As you know, Mr. Chairman, Job Corps is unique in several key ways:

- First, the Job Corps targets the most severely disadvantaged youth, as is displayed on the corpsmembers profile that we are submitting for the record.
- Second, the Job Corps provides a comprehensive array of services to all enrollees, including: vocational training, remedial education, health care, counseling and other services.

Third, the Job Corps is, with only limited exception, a residential program.

An independent evaluation of the post-program experience of enrollees entering the program in Fiscal Year 1977 -- prior to the doubling of the program -- indicates that the program is effective and that its benefits exceed its costs.

Obviously, given the nature and intensity of its services, the Job Corps is an expensive initiative. We estimate that, for Program Year 1984, the average cost per corpsmember will be $14,648; this compares with an estimated $13,683 for Fiscal Year 1983.

For Program Year 1985, we propose $600 million for the Job Corps. This funding, coupled with several cost-saving initiatives, will be adequate to maintain service levels at the current 40,544 slots.

In the late 1970s, the Job Corps undertook a major expansion, nearly doubling in size. The administrative and oversight capacities of the program do not appear to have kept pace with this expansion and problems developed on several fronts. From the outset of this administration, therefore, we have devoted substantial attention to rectifying the deficiencies in the overall administration and accountability of the Job Corps. And although these efforts are not yet complete, substantial progress has been made.

One of our first initiatives was to overhaul completely the Job Corps procurement system to provide a set of checks and balances that minimize the potential for abuse. We established standardized procedures for all procurement actions and clearly defined staff responsibilities in the procurement process. Major emphasis was placed on utilizing the competitive process in procurements.

Let me briefly summarize several other steps that we have taken:

-- To improve financial management systems, we established a unified budgetary structure for planning and tracking Job Corps costs. We strengthened accountability through the development of automated systems, revision of reporting requirements, and utilization of the unified budget system in planning, internal control and cost reporting.

-- A comprehensive audit program was implemented to eliminate a backlog of unaudited Job Corps contracts. The Department is now providing audit coverage -- including audit resolution and debt collection activities -- for all major functional areas.

- We have developed performance standards for the Job Corps. These standards will be in place this spring and will be incorporated into the procurement process for contract centers.

- During the last year, new procedures were implemented governing center operators' prevention, reporting and resolution of significant incidents.

- We completed a comprehensive review of all vocational training programs to determine their effectiveness and to identify high growth occupations which will offer incresed placement potential.

- Finally, we are developing improvements in our system for identifying and addressing facilities needs.

During the coming year we will continue to improve our fiscal control and management systems, including revising its administrative publications.

The changes that we have implemented have enabled us to restrain the growth of operational unit costs; in real terms, we have reduced them.

Rising program costs continue to be of major concern, however. We are submitting for the record a table summarizing program budget, service levels, and unit costs over recent years. As noted earlier, cost per service year is projected to rise to $14,648 in the 1984 Program Year. In addition to expenditures for operations, there are significant funding requirements for capital expenditures to maintain and assure the safety and health of the corpsmembers.

As noted before, our Fiscal Year 1985 budget will maintain the enrollee capacity at the level of 40,544 service years. To accomplish this in the face of rising costs, some cost-saving measures will be necessary. Specific measures will include: limiting capital expenditures for facility construction and rehabilitation; and increasing overall productivity through more efficient use of center resources. Even with these efficiencies, however, the cost per service year will continue to increase and Job Corps will remain one of the most expensive training programs in the country.

Mr. Chairman, you and the other members of the Committee are to be congratulated for undertaking this timely examination of the Job Corps. Given the resources it commands and the number of individuals it affects, we must assure that every element of the program is functioning efficiently. We must be confident that the program will increase the employment and earnings of those it serves, and that it does so more effectively than other, less costly alternatives.

It is in that context that the Department will continue to assess all aspects of the Job Corps. To support our efforts, we are initiating a comprehensive evaluation of the impacts of the program.

Although we believe we have made considerable progress in our efforts to strengthen the Job corps, we recognize that additional improvements are possible. With your support, and given the flexibility of the current legislation, we believe we will be able to increase the program's effectiveness in increasing the lifetime earnings and employment of the economically disadvantaged youth we serve.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear at these hearings. We will be happy to respond to your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

We are also happy that you have with you Mr. Roberts T. Jones, who is the Administrator of the Office of Comprehensive Employment and Training at the Department of Labor, and Mr. Peter Rell, of the Department of Labor, who is Director of the Job Corps.

We are happy to have you gentlemen with us as well. I would hope that any of you would feel free to respond to any of the questions that we have here this morning.

How much money is needed to maintain a 40,500-slot level, given the current programs only and no other competing uses of the funds?

Mr. O'KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1985 budget we have proposed $600 million for the program. We believe that that level of funding will be adequate to maintain the service level that you have just cited. It will, as I said, though, require some additional efficiencies in the management of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't the Conservation Corps Centers—doesn't their funding come right off the top of the DOL Job Corps appropriation?

Mr. O'KEEFE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did the Conservation Centers consume of your appropriations in fiscal year 1983?

Mr. O'KEEFE. I will ask Mr. Rell to give you that.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rell?

Mr. RELL. Mr. Chairman, I have the numbers for fiscal year 1984 handy, if that would suffice: approximately $56 million to the Department of Agriculture and approximately $36 million to the Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. Somewhere near $90 million?

Mr. RELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of this do you expect to save in fiscal year 1985 if the CCC's are contracted out to the private sector?

Mr. O'KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if we can bring the CCC's into a competitive cost range with the DOL-administered programs, we estimate the savings would be on the order of $15 million.

The CHAIRMAN. I see. Now the Conservation Centers are operated by the Interior and the Agriculture Departments; am I right on that?

Mr. O'KEEFE. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much coordination is there between the DOL and these two Departments with regard to these items?

Mr. O'KEEFE. There is coordination at the departmental level in terms of overall policy formulation, the formulation of the budget request, things such as that.

I will ask Mr. Jones or Mr. Rell to comment further, but they do have a substantial amount of autonomy, as any other Federal agency should of our agency.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Do you care to comment?

Mr. RELL. In addition to the planning and policy development interagency at the national level, the DOL [Department of Labor] regional offices, also monitor and conduct reviews of the Civilian Conservation Centers on an annual basis, Mr. Chairman. As a result of those reviews, inevitably, as one might expect, there are problems, difficulties, and shortcomings. Those are then worked out on a cooperative basis between the Department of Labor regional offices and the appropriate people in the Agriculture and Interior agencies.

The Chairman. What are the major differences between the Job Corps Centers run by Interior and Agriculture besides the cost in administrative apparatus? Are there any significant differences in outcome for students enrolled in these two types of centers?

Mr. O'Keefe. There are not, as far as I know, differences in the outcomes by center that we have been able to identify. I do not think we have had an evaluation that would give you a solid answer to that, though, Senator.

The Chairman. Who is responsible for auditing the Conservation Centers' programs, and when were the audits undertaken last year?

Mr. Rell. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture Centers were last audited in fiscal year 1978 by the Department of Labor's Office of the Inspector General. The Department of the Interior Centers have been audited on an individual, center-by-center basis by the Department of the Interior's Office of the Inspector General. Depending on which center we are talking about, the audit coverage, the last audit coverage is somewhere between 1975 and 1981.

The Chairman. Turning to vocational and basic education programs, what was the impetus for the vocational review undertaken by the Employment and Training Administration last year?

Mr. O'Keefe. Mr. Chairman, with a program as expensive per participant as the Job Corps Program is, one cannot afford to take opportunity to reduce those costs and increase effectiveness. The basic policy purpose for that review was to make sure that every vocational offering that we have there is going to the maximum extent possible increase the competitiveness of the Job Corps member when they move back into the regular labor market. It was a very thorough review.

I think both Mr. Jones and Mr. Rell, and those who supported them in it, have done a great service to the program. We expect real benefit from it in the coming years.

The Chairman. What were your findings from that review?

Mr. O'Keefe. I would ask Peter to summarize that for you.

Mr. Rell. Mr. Chairman, on an overall basis, we discovered that the current vocational offers in Job Corps are well targeted in relation to the expected labor market demand through 1990. We did, however, identify a number of new occupations which would be very suitable for Job Corps trainees and which we will be considering for addition to the curriculum. Those are primarily clerical occupations, health-related occupations, and automated data processing-related occupations.

We analyzed our past success in various different vocational offerings, Mr. Chairman, and assessed their relative effectiveness. We have targeted a close examination of those which show to be relatively less effective. We will do such an examination on a center-by-center basis in order to take into account the characteristics of the Corps members attending, particularly centers in the local labor markets that those centers serve.

Any decisions to replace relatively ineffective occupations with perhaps some of the new ones that we have identified will be made on a center-by-center basis.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you plan to keep the vocational programs current vis-a-vis the labor market? In other words, how can a national program like Job Corps be responsive to the local demand for various occupations?

Mr. O'KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask Peter again to address that in more detail, but I would like to offer at this time that we submit for the record the vocational study that we did, the summary volumes of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we will place that in the record at this point.

[Material supplied for the record follows:]

JOB CORPS
VOCATIONAL REVIEW

PURPOSE

- Identify changes appropriate in Job Corps vocational offerings
- Not an evaluation of overall Job Corps program performance

APPROACH

- Used workgroup supplemented by Advisory Committee of outside experts
- Examined BLS demand projections to 1990 for potential offerings
- Examined JC offerings to assess past success in terms of outcomes and cost

METHODOLOGY

- Analyzed BLS projections for high growth occupations with education/skill requirements appropriate to Job Corps
- Analyzed existing occupations and ranked them in terms of relative effectiveness
  - FY 82 data was used with restricted definitions
- Effectiveness criteria used with weights assigned by managers are

Effectiveness Criteria	Weight
Percent Job Place	4
Average Wage at Job Entry	1
Cost per Job Placement	4
Cost per Training Year	2
Absolute Employment Growth, 1980-1990	2
Percentage Employment Growth, 1980-1990	1

- The weights represent a balance between outcomes (5) and costs (6)
  - unweighted rankings produce very similar results
- No attempt was made to assess occupations in terms of inherent value or prestige nor to evaluate process factors such as quality of instruction

- To guide examination of particular offerings, the ranking list was divided into three groups -- upper, middle and lower
  - occupations with effectiveness scores more than one standard deviation below the mean score were designated for special attention
  - occupations with cost per job placement exceeding twice the national average or having negative growth projections were also specially identified

RESULTS

- The relative effectiveness rank of occupations -- broken out by service provider -- is shown on Attachment 1
  - lower group shows a disproportionate number of nationally contracted and CCC operated occupations vs center operated training
  - generally, center operated occupations had relatively low costs and low outcomes; nationally contracted occupational training had relatively high costs and high outcomes; CCC trained occupations were in the middle
- 12 new high growth occupations were identified as potential additions to existing occupational offerings in five areas
  - Clerical
    - .. Work Processing Machine Operator
    - .. Data Entry Operator
    - .. Bookeeping/Billing Machine Operator
    - .. Payroll Clerk
    - .. Proof Machine Operator
  - Electrical/Appliance Repair
    - .. Office Machine Repairer
  - Industrial Production
    - .. Production Painter
  - Health Occupations
    - .. Emergency Medical Technician
    - .. Surgical Technician
    - .. X-Ray Technician

- ADP Related Occupations
  - Computer and Peripheral ADP Equipment Operator
  - Computer Service Technician

IMPLEMENTATION

- Since the study results are based on national averages, they provide only a starting point for making center-by-center changes
  - a poorly rated occupation may do very well at particular centers and very poorly at others
- Contract Centers, CCC's and national training providers will be asked to examine offerings in the lower group of occupations (and extreme cost and negative growth occupations) and to recommend replacement or continuation
  - to continue an occupation rated low on a national basis, a center or contractor would need to demonstrate
    - performance substantially better than the national average for that occupation and/or
    - substantially lower costs and/or
    - substantially better labor market prospects in the local labor markets relevant to the center's corpsmembers
  - centers with occupations at the very bottom of the rankings (below the standard deviation line) will be required to submit a preponderance of convincing evidence to retain that occupation
- This process will ensure that local input relevant to corpsmembers training at each center will be considered (rather than arbitrary national decisions)
  - centers and national contractors will also have the opportunity to factor in most recent (PY 83) performance and to make/propose cost reductions
- Centers will propose new occupations from either the top rated group of occupations or the list of potential new occupations identified in the study
- Final decisionmaking will be at the national level
  - equipment and curricula for new occupations may be centrally procured if cost savings can be achieved
  - legislative requirements to increase female enrollment will considered in making final decisions

- As decisions are made, appropriate modifications will be made to

  - center operating contracts

  - national training contracts

  - CCC staffing

  In the interim, national training contracts are being written for a 15 month period (4/1/84-6/30/85) at the current level with provisions to incorporate the final decisions regarding vocational changes on a center by center basis

  Finally, a system for updating/improving the vocational review study will be established to ensure that all vocational offerings are reviewed on a regular (e.g., bi-annual) basis

ATTACHMENT I

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

UPPER GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE	
1. Auto Parts Clerk	45	Center	126	
2. Welder, Gas Metal Arc.	60	Center	116	
3. Forklift Operator	27	Center	113	
4. Kitchen Helper*	32	Center/CCC	111	
5. Electronics Ass.	631	Center	110	
6. Security Guard	84	Center	109	
7. Machine Operator	82	Center	108	
8. Sheet Metal Worker	26	Center	108	
9. Warehouseman	180	Center	106	
10. Pest Control	42	Center	103	
11. Retail Sales Clerk	433	Center	102	
12. Insulation Worker	25	Center	101	
13. Electrician	623	Center	99	
14. Dental Assistant	87	Center	99	
15. Cook, Short Order	54	Center	99	
16. Ward Clerk	188	Center	98	
17. Clerk, General	62	B.R.A.C.	98	
18. Teller	27	Center	97	
19. Clerk, General	598	Center	96	X
20. Electronic Tech.	25	Center	95	
21. Nurse's Assistant	3,067	Center	94	
22. Auto Service/Repairer	981	Center	94	
23. Auto Service/Repairer	222	CCC	93	
24. Cashier/Checker	161	Center	91	
25. Diesel Mechanic	28	Center	91	
26. Electrician	149	N.A.H.B.	90	
27. Landscaper	397	Center	89	
28. Auto Mechanic Helper	562	Center	88	
29. Hosp. Diet. Aide	39	Center	88	
30. Clerk-Typist	3,154	Center	87	
31. Brick/Stone Mason	45	CCC	87	
32. Auto Body Repair	777	Center	86	
33. Painter	95	N.A.H.B.	86	
34. Meat Cutter	71	Center	85	

X Upper Standard Deviation Line
Mean Score = 78
Standard Deviation = 18

ATTACHMENT I

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

MIDDLE GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
35. Combination Welder	1,880	Center	84
36. Accounting Clerk	276	Center	84
37. Machinist	87	Center	84
38. Waiter/Waitress	31	Center	84
39. Painter	431	Center	83
40. Electricial Appl.	103	Center	83
41. Machine Operator, Lathe	45	Center	83
42. Professional Program Aide	42	Center	83
43. Plumber	277	Center	81
44. Custodial Maint.	232	N.A.H.B.	80
45. Solor Installer	139	N.A.H.B.	80
46. Licensed Prac. Nurse	76	Center	80
47. Cement Mason	55	CCC	80
48. Brick/Stone Mason	639	Center	79
49. Bookkeeper	313	Center	79
50. Clerk Typist	51	B.R.A.C.	79 ($)
51. Cook	1,940	Center	78
52. Welder, Spot	601	Center	78
53. Air Cond/Ref. Mech.	245	Center	78
54. Offset Printer	213	Center	78
55. Electrician Helper	62	Center	78
56. Plumber	209	N.A.H.B.	77
57. Draftsman	160	Center	76
58. Custodial Maint.	1,226	Center	75
59. Brick/Stone Mason	88	N.A.H.B	75
60. Receptionist	144	Center	74
61. Welder, Combination	930	CCC	74
62. Auto Ser. Repair	131	U.A.W.	73 ($)
63. Ser. Stat. Atten.	121	Center	73
64. Telecommunications	56	AFL-CIO	73
65. Welder, Spot	50	CCC	73
66. Secretary	69	Center	72
67. Furniture Uphol.	60	Center	72
68. Auto Body Repair	51	U.A.W.	72
69. Carpenter Const.	693	Center	71
70. Carpenter Const.	220	N.A.H.B.	71
71. Radio/TV Repair	47	Center	71
72. Floor Layer*	34	Center/IBPAT	71

ATTACHMENT I

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

LOWER GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE	
73. Service Stat. Att.	30	AFL-CIO	70	
74. Carpenter Const.	1,228	U.B.C.J.A.	69	
75. Cement Mason	338	OPE/CMI	69	
76. Teacher/Nursery	124	Center	69	
77. Combination Welder	44	AFL-CIO	69	
78. Engineer Aide/	30	I.U.O.E.	69 ($)	
79. Heavy Equip. Oper.	158	I.U.O.E.	68 ($)	
80. Auto Mech. Helper	109	CCC	68	
81. Tilesetter	58	I.M.I.	68 ($)	
82. Stock Clerk	85	CCC	67	
83. Small Gas Eng. Rep.	67	Center	67	
84. Calc. Mach. Oper.	47	Center	67 (&)	
85. Deckhand	34	I.M.U.	67 (&)	
86. Brick/Stone Mason	539	I.M.I.	65	
87. Forestry/Conser.	127	CCC	64	
88. Cement Mason	52	Center	64	
89. Medical Assistant	100	Center	63	
90. Painter	456	I.B.P.A.T.	62	
91. Animal Caretaker	25	Center	62	
92. Conts. Labor	93	CCC	62	
93. Heavy Equip. Rep.	27	I.U.O.E.	61 ($)	
94. Custodial Maint.	540	CCC	60	XX
95. Railway Clerk	101	B.R.A.C.	59 ($) ($)	
96. Cook	646	CCC	57	
97. Keypunch Operator	359	Center	57 (&)	
98. Baker	244	Center	57	
99. Heavy Equip. Oper.	227	Center	56	
100. Duplicating Machine Operator	73	Center	55	
101. Cement Mason	[illegible]	N.A.H.B.	54 ($)	
102. Cosmetologist	61	Center	54	
103. Plasterer	[illegible]	O.P.C.M.I	49 ($)	
104. Medical Lab Ass't.	27	Center/AFL-CIO	47	
105. Clerk-Typist	64	CCC	43 ($)	
106. Stenographer	46	Center	41 (&)	
107. Heavy Equip. Rep.	75	Center	31 ($)	
108. Mail Clerk	38	AFL-CIO	29 ($)	

*Data on trainees from two procurement groups were added together to have a smaple of more than 25 trainees.

$Cost Per Job Placement exceeds twice the National Average of #3,076.

&Projected Absolute Growth of less than 1,000 new jobs between 1980-1990.

XXLower Standard Deviation Line

ATTACHMENT I

CODE KEY FOR TRAINING PROVIDERS

CODE	EXPLANATION
AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor Congress of Industrial Organizations
B.R.A.C.	Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks
CENTER	Contract Center
CCC	Civilian Conservation Center
I.B.P.A.T.	International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades
I.M.I.	International Masonry Institute
I.M.U.	International Maritime Union
I.U.O.E.	International Union of Operating Engineers
N.A.H.B.	National Association of Homebuilders
O.P./C.M.I.	Operation Plasterers and Cement Mason's International Association
U.A.W.	United Automobile Workers
U.B.C.J.A.	United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

JOB CORPS
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OFFERINGS REVIEW

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

November 1983

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During FY 83, the National Office of Job Corps conducted a review of FY 82 vocational training offerings and an examination of labor market trends and projections relevant to potential vocational training offerings. The purpose of the review was to evaluate the relative effectiveness of current Job Corps vocational offerings and to identify occupations suitable for addition to the Job Corps vocational curricula. The review was not intended as an assessment of the overall effectiveness of the Job Corps program or individual center performances but rather to take a long hard look at which training occupations Job Corps should be offering to their corpsmembers to increase their employability throughout the 80's.

A Vocational Advisory Board was appointed at the beginning of the review project. The Board included representatives of industry, labor unions, the federal government, unviersity faculty, and a nationwide educational testing service. All the participants have extensive backgrounds in vocational training. Several members have been indirectly associated with the Job Corps program for many years. However, active Job Corps contractors were not selected to serve on the council.

The major functions of the Vocational Advisory Board were concerned with research. The members reviewed the research design and suggested methods to obtain and analyze data. The objectives of the study were discussed particularly possible outcomes and redirection of vocational offerings.

The Vocational Advisory Board met periodically and actively participated in the vocational review making major contributions to the work. The members' expertise and assistance was of substantial assistance in conducting the review and formulating recommendations.

A system for aggregating and analyzing information about Job Corps training offerings was developed for the review using labor market projections and occupational outlook materials from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), demographic and placement outcome data from the Job Corps Management Information System (MIS) and training cost data collected from centers and national contractors. From these data criteria for judging the relative effectiveness of current Job Corps occupations were chosen and Job Corps managers assigned weight to the criteria dependent upon their importance in judging occupational effectiveness. The six criteria chosen represented a balance between placement, cost and projections data. Training occupations were ranked on each of the six criteria and scored dependent upon their rank in relation to the other occupations and the weight assigned by the Job Corps managers. Occupational effectiveness scores were computed by totaling each occupations scores on each of the criteria. The following are the six criteria used and the weights that were assigned.

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA	WEIGHT
1. Percent Job Placed	4
2. Average Wage of Job	1
3. Cost Per Job Placement	4
4. Cost Per Training Year	2
5. Absolute Employment Growth, 1980-1990	2
6. Percentage Employment Growth, 1980-1990	1

A ranked list of 80 Job Corps training occupations separated by the training provider was produced using the total occupational effectiveness score to indicate which current occupations were relatively more effective than others. The list was divided into three groups -- upper, middle and lower dependent upon the occupations rank in occupational effectiveness, (see Attachment 1). Since the analysis is based on national data, the implementation of the vocational changes will carefully examine potential offerings to be replaced on a center-by-center basis to ensure that a change at that particular center is as appropriate as the overall national ranking list suggests. Centers will be asked to examine those training occupations in the lower group and suggest alternative training occupations if performance in an occupation was also poor at the center level. Fourteen training occupations had occupational effectiveness score more than one standard deviation below the mean score of 78. Centers will be asked to replace these training occupations with those with high effectiveness scores or with new occupations identified as appropriate for addition to Job Corps unless the center can provide substantial evidence to warrant their retention.

New training occupations with potential for addition to Job Corps vocational training offerings were identified by examining Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment Survey (OES) data and choosing those who met the criteria of being high growth occupations that required less than two years of training and a high school or less education. Before being included on a list of potential additions, an occupation had to have a growth of over 10,000 new job openings and 18.5% overall increase in the next ten years and gain consensus approval from a panel of National Job Corps staff. Attachment II is the final list of suitable new training occupations.

The examination of BLS projections data revealed the fact that Job Corps is currently well targeted in its vocational offerings, providing training mostly in entry level occupations which can be considered high growth. By conducting this vocational review and repeating the process periodically, the national office of Job Corps can assure that the substantial majority of Job Corps enrollees have the opportunity to be trained in the occupations with the best overall performance records and potential in the labor market. It will ensure that new high growth occupations are introduced into the Job Corps system, and that demonstrably poor performing occupations are regularly identified, reviewed and eliminated unless special circumstances warrant their continuation. In this manner, Job Corps centers—will retain the flexibility needed to tailor their training programs to corpsmember's needs.

5

ATTACHMENT I

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

MIDDLE GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
35. Combination Welder	1,880	Center	84
36. Accounting Clerk	276	Center	84
37. Machinist	87	Center	84
38. Waiter/Waitress	31	Center	84
39. Painter	431	Center	83
40. Electricial Appl.	103	Center	83
41. Machine Operator, Lathe	45	Center	83
42. Professional Program Aide	42	Center	83
43. Plumber	277	Center	81
44. Custodial Maint.	232	N.A.H.B.	80
45. Solor Installer	139	N.A.H.B.	80
46. Licensed Prac. Nurse	76	Center	80
47. Cement Mason	55	CCC	80
48. Brick/Stone Mason	639	Center	79
49. Bookkeeper	313	Center	79
50. Clerk Typist	51	B.R.A.C.	79 ($)
51. Cook	1,940	Center	78
52. Welder, Spot	601	Center	78
53. Air Cond/Ref. Mech.	245	Center	78
54. Offset Printer	213	Center	78
55. Electrician Helper	62	Center	78
56. Plumber	209	N.A.H.B.	77
57. Draftsman	160	Center	76
58. Custodial Maint.	1,226	Center	75
59. Brick/Stone Mason	88	N.A.H.B	75
60. Receptionist	144	Center	74
61. Welder, Combination	930	CCC	74
62. Auto Ser. Repair	131	U.A.W.	73 ($)
63. Ser. Stat. Atten.	121	Center	73
64. Telecommunications	56	AFL-CIO	73
65. Welder, Spot	50	CCC	73
66. Secretary	69	Center	72
67. Furniture Uphol.	60	Center	72
68. Auto Body Repair	51	U.A.W.	72
69. Carpenter Const.	693	Center	71
70. Carpenter Const.	220	N.A.H.B.	71
71. Radio/TV Repair	47	Center	71
72. Floor Layer*	34	Center/IBPAT	71

ATTACHMENT I

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

UPPER GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
1. Auto Parts Clerk	45	Center	126
2. Welder, Gas Metal Arc.	60	Center	116
3. Forklift Operator	27	Center	113
4. Kitchen Helper*	32	Center/CCC	111
5. Electronics Ass.	631	Center	110
6. Security Guard	84	Center	109
7. Machine Operator	82	Center	108
8. Sheet Metal Worker	26	Center	108
9. Warehouseman	180	Center	106
10. Pest Control	42	Center	103
11. Retail Sales Clerk	433	Center	102
12. Insulation Worker	25	Center	101
13. Electrician	623	Center	99
14. Dental Assistant	87	Center	99
15. Cook, Short Order	54	Center	99
16. Ward Clerk	188	Center	98
17. Clerk, General	62	B.R.A.C.	98
18. Teller	27	Center	97
19. Clerk, General	598	Center	96
20. Electronic Tech.	25	Center	95
21. Nurse's Assistant	3,067	Center	94
22. Auto Service/Repairer	981	Center	94
23. Auto Service/Repairer	222	CCC	93
24. Cashier/Checker	161	Center	91
25. Diesel Mechanic	28	Center	91
26. Electrician	149	N.A.H.B.	90
27. Landscaper	397	Center	89
28. Auto Mechanic Helper	562	Center	88
29. Hosp. Diet. Aide	39	Center	88
30. Clerk-Typist	3,154	Center	87
31. Brick/Stone Mason	45	CCC	87
32. Auto Body Repair	777	Center	86
33. Painter	95	N.A.H.B.	86
34. Meat Cutter	71	Center	85

X Upper Standard Deviation Line
Mean Score = 78
Standard Deviation = 18

ATTACHMENT I

CODE KEY FOR TRAINING PROVIDERS

CODE	EXPLANATION
AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor Congress of Industrial Organizations
B.R.A.C.	Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks
CENTER	Contract Center
CCC	Civilian Conservation Center
I.B.P.A.T.	International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades
I.M.I.	International Masonry Institute
I.M.U.	International Maritime Union
I.U.O.E.	International Union of Operating Engineers
N.A.H.B.	National Association of Homebuilders
O.P./C.M.I.	Operation Plasterers and Cement Mason's International Association
U.A.W.	United Automobile Workers
U.B.C.J.A.	United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

ATTACHMENT I

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

LOWER GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
73. Service Stat. Att.	30	AFL-CIO	70
74. Carpenter Const.	1,228	U.B.C.J.A.	69
75. Cement Mason	338	OPE/CMI	69
76. Teacher/Nursery	124	Center	69
77. Combination Welder	44	AFL-CIO	69
78. Engineer Aide/	30	I.U.O.E.	69 ($)
79. Heavy Equip. Oper.	158	I.U.O.E.	68 ($)
80. Auto Mech. Helper	109	CCC	68
81. Tilesetter	58	I.M.I.	68 ($)
82. Stock Clerk	85	CCC	67
83. Small Gas Eng. Rep.	67	Center	67
84. Calc. Mach. Oper.	47	Center	67 (&)
85. Deckhand	34	I.M.U.	67 (&)
86. Brick/Stone Mason	539	I.M.I.	65
87. Forestry/Conser.	127	CCC	64
88. Cement Mason	52	Center	64
89. Medical Assistant	100	Center	63
90. Painter	456	I.B.P.A.T.	62
91. Animal Caretaker	25	Center	62
92. Conts. Labor	93	CCC	62
93. Heavy Equip. Rep.	27	I.U.O.E.	61 ($)
94. Custodial Maint.	540	CCC	60 XX
95. Railway Clerk	101	B.R.A.C.	59 ($) (&)
96. Cook	646	CCC	57
97. Keypunch Operator	359	Center	57 (&)
98. Baker	244	Center	57
99. Heavy Equip. Oper.	227	Center	56
100. Duplicating Machine Operator	73	Center	55
101. Cement Mason	90	N.A.H.B.	54 ($)
102. Cosmetologist	67	Center	54
103. Plasterer	290	O.P.C.M.I	49 ($)
104. Medical Lab Ass't.	27	Center/AFL-CIO	47
105. Clerk-Typist	64	CCC	43 ($)
106. Stenographer	46	Center	41 (&)
107. Heavy Equip. Rep.	75	Center	31 ($)
108. Mail Clerk	38	AFL-CIO	29 ($)

*Data on trainees from two procurement groups were added together to have a smaple of more than 25 trainees.

$Cost Per Job Placement exceeds twice the National Average of $3,076.

&Projected Absolute Growth of less than 1,000 new jobs between 1980-1990.

XXLower Standard Deviation Line

ATTACHMENT II

New Job Corps Training Offerings

A. CLERICAL AND SALES CLUSTER

1. Word Processing Machine Operator
2. Data Entry Operator
3. Bookkeeping/Billing Machine Operator
4. Payroll Clerk
5. Proof Machine Operator

B. ELECTRICIAL/APPLIANCE REPAIR

1. Office Machine Repairer

C. INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

1. Production Painter

D. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS

1. Emergency Medical Technician
2. Surgical Technician
3. X-Ray Technician

E. POTENTIAL HIGH TECHNOLOGY OCCUPATIONS

1. Computer and Peripheral EDP Equipment Operator
2. Computer Service Technician

JOB CORPS
VOCATIONAL OFFERINGS REVIEW

Final Report

October 1983

FINAL REPORT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. DATA COLLECTION 3

III. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS 5

A. Characteristics of Job Corps Enrollees 5

B. FY 82 Vocational Offerings, Outcomes, Cost and Labor Market Prospects 6

C. Assessment of the Relative Effectiveness of Current Occupations 16

D. Assessment of the Three Groups of Training Providers 20

E. New High Growth Occupations 24

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS 29

TABLES

Table 1 - The Largest Job Corps Training Occupations (FY 82) 7

Table 2 - Outcome and Growth Data for Job Corps Occupational Training 11

Table 3 - Training Occupation Relative Effectiveness Rank 21

Table 4 - New Job Corps Training Offerings 27

I. INTRODUCTION

This Final Report presents a summary of the major findings resulting from the Job Corps Vocational Offerings Review as well as principal recommendations.

Job Corps currently provides training in 120 recorded occupations. Vocational offerings have changed over the program's 18 year history in response to individual assessments of the effectiveness of particular offerings at specific locations. This review represents the first comprehensive national assessment of current vocational offerings in light of their relative effectiveness -- outcomes and costs -- and prospects in the overall labor market through the remainder of this decade.

The purpose of the review was twofold: to evaluate the relative effectiveness of current Job Corps vocational offerings and to identify occupations suitable for addition to the Job Corps vocational curricula. To accomplish this, attention was focused on (1) the extent to which vocational training is aligned with current and future labor market demands, (2) the relative effectiveness of occupational offerings and (3) the advisability of replacing less effective training programs with more effective or more promising training programs.

The review was not intended as an assessment of the overall effectiveness of the Job Corps program or vocational training in Job Corps. The overall effectiveness of the Job Corps program has been addressed through much more comprehensive, longitudinally-based studies. This review is restricted to (1) a comparison (with each other) of current training occupations, including -- where it exists -- a differentiation within occupations by major types of training providers, and (2) an analysis of additional occupations which represent potential Job Corps offerings.

The basis for this approach was to focus on increasing effectiveness. Even though the major evaluation studies (e.g. "Evaluation of the Economic Impact of the Job Corps Program," Mathematica Policy Research, 1982) show Job Corps to be an effective education and training program on an overall basis, effectiveness can be enhanced by:

- eliminating current offerings with relatively poor performance and/or poor prospects in the labor market.
- retaining and/or expanding current offerings with relatively superior performance and/or good prospects in the labor market.
- adding new occupations with good labor market prospects.

Thus, the review focuses on internal comparisons of vocational offerings and an examination of potential new occupations.

This final report summarizes and references seven "Documentation Reports." They cover the (1) Job Corps vocational training activity in FY 1982, (2) identification of high growth occupations which might be added to those in which the Job Corps now trains, (3) assessment of training requirements for high demand occupations suitable for corpsmembers, (4) cost analysis for FY 1982 training occupations, (5) ranking of relative performance of occupational training, (6) decision making on what occupations should be offered, and (7) options for further vocational education offerings reviews.

II. DATA COLLECTION

The analysis focused on three groups of data: (1) demographic and outcome data from the Job Corps Management Information System (MIS), (2) cost data by training occupation collected from the centers and national contractors, and (3) labor market information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

The Job Corps Management Information System (MIS) was the primary source for demographic and outcome data. This system contains data on Corpsmembers upon enrollment, at termination, and 3-6 months after termination from Job Corps. The MIS enrollment data is almost totally complete. Information on over 96% of all youth who enroll is present in the enrollment database. The termination and post-termination (placement) data are less complete, but still account for 80-90% of the Job Corps population. Data from seven centers (3 of which were in start-up or transition phases) were unavailable. In addition, those occupations with fewer than 25 corpsmembers were not included in the analysis. Not all of the data are specific to training occupations and not all of the occupation-specific data are reliable. Problems with the standardization of some of the variables in the termination and placement file led to their elimination in rating the relative effectiveness of Job Corps training occupations.

Characteristics of the corpsmembers; type, magnitude, and regional dispersion of the training occupation; and outcomes of the training, specifically, job placement outcomes, were examined closely.

The Job Corps Centers and National Contractors provided information on training years and vocational costs for specific training occupations --data used to calculate cost factors. This effort was not an easy task. Vocational costs had not been recorded at the specific occupational level since the Job Corps financial reporting requirements do not specify that accounting systems must maintain such data. Therefore, these costs had to be estimated at the majority of the Job Corps Centers.

National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) data on the educational level and training time required for potential new Job Corps training occupations was combined with Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data on the projected growth of relevant occupations in actual numbers and percentages to identify occupations which were within the capabilities of Job Corpsmembers. Further information on potential additions to Job Corps was gleaned from the Occupational Outlook Handbook and other identified labor market information. These data were used to identify new occupations which could be projected to do well in the Job Corps environment for the next decade and to determine which existing Job Corps occupations would continue to do well.

Achieving the ideal in measurement and analysis is rarely realized. This study was limited in scope by the time and available data. However, much new information was obtained about Job Corps vocational offerings. This review provides the most comprehensive analysis of the Job Corps vocational program to date. The following pages summarize the findings and recommendations of the Vocational Offerings Review. More detailed and substantial information on each of the topics discussed here is available in the bulk of the analysis which is contained in Documentation Reports 1 through 7.

III. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A. Characteristics of Job Corps Enrollees

During FY 1982, Job Corps enrolled over 52,000 corpsmembers at 105 centers in 43 states and Puerto Rico. Slightly over one-half of the FY 1982 enrollees were assigned to Job Corps centers in their home state. After leaving Job Corps, at least 15 percent of the trainees relocate to a new locality instead of returning to their earlier residence. This information substantiates the fact that Job Corps, as a nationwide training program, provides service to locales beyond the borders of the local Job Corps training areas. It also makes the job of aligning training offerings with occupational employment demands in relevant labor markets very difficult at some centers.

Of the 52,902 recorded new Job Corps enrollees, 62 percent were male and 38 percent were female. Fifty-five percent of the corpsmembers were black, 30 percent white, 8.2 percent Hispanic, 3.6 percent American Indian, and 3 percent Asian and Pacific Islander. Nineteen percent of the enrollees had completed 12 or more years of schooling and a similar percentage could read at over 8th grade level. While only 4.7 percent had completed 7 or fewer grades of school, over half could not read at the 7th grade level. The median school year completed was 10 and the median grade reading level was about 6. (See Documentation Report No. 1 for regional breakdowns.)

B. FY 82 Vocational Offerings, Outcomes, Costs and Labor Market Prospects

1. Occupations

Job Corps provided training in 120 recorded occupations to corpsmembers who were enrolled at least 90 days and who terminated in FY 1982. Eighty of the training occupations had at least 25 trainees who had been in Job Corps 90 days or longer. The largest 8 occupations accounted for 57.9 percent (18,568) of the 32,033 90 day + terminees. As Table 1 illustrates, during FY 1982, over 1,000 trainees were enrolled in each of the 8 largest occupations, led by clerk typist at 3,269. The largest twenty-two training occupations accounted for 84 percent of the 90 days + terminees. In each, at least 300 corpsmembers received training.

Table 1 also shows the percentage of males and females enrolled each of the 22 largest Job Corps occupations. Six of these had predominantly female enrollment -- clerk typist; nurse's assistant; clerk, general; retail sales clerk, keypunch operator; and bookkeeper. An examination of females enrollments revealed that Job Corps trains a relatively high percentage of women in non-traditional occupations. For example, 18 percent of the trainees in the painter program are women. Likewise, 12.8 percent of those training to become electricians were women, (compared to 4.1 percent in Vocational Education programs nationally [1]) in addition to 11.9 percent in custodial maintenance, 8.5 percent in Auto Mechanic Helper and 8.1 percent in Auto Body Repair.

---

[1] U.S. Dept. of Labor, National Center for Education Statistics, Vocational Education Data System.

TABLE 1
The Largest Job Corps Training Occupations (FY 1982)

Training Occupation	Number Trained ≥ 90 Days	Percent Male	Percent Female
Clerk Typist	3,269	17.7	82.3
Nurse's Assistant	3,081	15.7	84.3
Combination Welder	2,854	93.6	6.4
Cook	2,600	61.8	38.2
Carpenter	2,121	92.3	7.7
Custodial Maintenance	1,998	88.1	11.9
Auto Service Repairer	1,334	94.3	5.7
Brick and Stone Mason	1,311	96.0	4.0
Painter	982	82.0	18.0
Auto Body Repair	841	91.9	8.1
Electrician	793	87.2	12.8
Clerk, General	678	18.7	81.3
Auto Mechanic Helper	674	91.5	8.5
Welder, Spot	651	90.0	10.0
Electronic Assembler	631	61.6	38.4
Cement Mason	585	94.5	5.5
Plumber	508	96.3	3.7
Retail Sales Clerk	433	32.1	67.9
Landscaper	423	79.1	20.9
Heavy Equipment Operator	384	94.0	6.0
Keypunch Operator	370	22.8	77.2
Bookkeeper	313	33.2	66.8

Job Corps provides new corpsmembers with an opportunity to survey all center vocations through its Occupational Exploration Program. All corpsmembers have free access to entry into any occupation for which they have the requisite reading and math levels. Corpsmembers also have the option of changing vocational areas after program entry, and some choose to train in more than one occupation while in Job Corps.

2. Outcomes

Since the focus of this review was to assess vocational offerings, outcome data are restricted to reported terminees who were enrolled at least 90 days and, thus, had at least some opportunity to receive vocational training. Outcome data for these terminees is presented for two measures -- percent job placed and average wage at job entry. The job placement measure is defined differently from other job placement measures used in Job Corps to assess centers and overall program performance. Depending on the purpose -- i.e., what aspects of performance are being assessed -- a variety of measures are used.

The placement rate measure used in this review shows artificially low numbers compared to other related measures since it:

- does not include placements in the military
- does not include placements in further education and training such as vocational/technical schools, community colleges, and colleges.
- includes incomplete records for terminees whom placement agencies could not locate and who may have obtained jobs.

- focuses only on terminees who stayed at least 90 days
- excludes occupations with less than 25 terminees recorded in FY 82
- includes all such terminees whether or not those terminees were available for placement

The most broadly defined measure -- those placed in jobs, military or school as a percent of terminees available for placement -- shows a success rate of 86.6% for FY 82. A more restricted measure -- those placed in jobs as a percent of terminees available for placement-- showed 57.4% for FY 82. Even including those not available for placement, the overall job placement rate reported for FY 82 was 53.6%. The data restrictions placed on the measure used in the vocational review result in a 46.7% placement rate. While this undoubtedly understates the overall success rate for the program, the definition was consistently applied to the specific occupations and provides an adequate basis for comparative analysis of the existing offerings.

One caveat to the usefulness of the restricted measure applies to occupations with predominantly female enrollment. Job placement in some of the large occupations with primarily female enrollment was lower than that for some programs with primarily male enrollment. These results are at least partially due to the method of computing job placement rates in this study. Since, historically, many more ex-corpswomen leave the labor force upon termination than do corpsmen, the use of all terminees as the computational base instead of those available for placement undoubtedly yields relatively lower job placement rates for females.

Table 2 provides overall outcomes for each occupation by major training provider in terms of (1) the two major outcome measures -- placement rate and job entry wage, (2) the two cost measures--cost per job placement and cost per training year, and (3) labor market measures--absolute and percent growth of the occupation. Other outcome measures, such as completion rates, training related placements and related measures, were considered and rejected due to data availability problems and other factors as discussed more fully in Documentation Report 1.

Occupational job placement rates varied from a high of 88% for Electronic Technicians to a low of 13% for mail clerk. Average wage at job entry varied from a high of $6.39 per hour for a clerk typist trained by a national contractor to a low of $3.35 per hour for Hospital Dietary Aide trained by center operators.

Documentation Reports 1 and 5 discuss these outcomes in more detail. The use of these outcome measures in assessing relative effectiveness as well as differences in training providers are summarized in Section C of this Final Report.

3. Costs

Table 2 also provides the direct training costs for each occupation by training provider in terms of two measures -- cost per training year and cost per job placement. Cost per training year ranged from, a high of $8,923 for Engineer Aide/Rodman trained by a national contractor to $458 for Teller trained by center operators. Cost per placement ranged from a high of $13,384 for Engineer Aide/Rodman trained by a national contractor to $607 for Pest Control trained by center operators.

TABLE 2

OUTCOME AND GROWTH DATA FOR JOB CORPS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

TRAINING OCCUPATION	TRAINING PROVIDER	NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENT JOB PLACED	AVERAGE WAGE OF JOB	COST PER JOB PLACEMENT	COST PER TRAINING YEAR	ABSOLUTE GROWTH	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
Sub-Professional								
Draftsman	Center	168	45.0	$ 4.14	$ 2,637	$1,124	87,000	27.0
Cosmetologist	Center	67	47.7	3.64	3,651	1,350	17,453	11.9
Eng. Aide/Rodman	I.U.O.E.	30	66.6	4.61	13,304	8,923	74,309	18.6
Electronic Tech.	Center	25	88.0	6.19	3,552	3,086	109,000	29.8
Prof. Prep. Aide	Center	42	38.0	3.89	950	400	21,891	17.2
Clerical/Sales								
Clerk Typist	Center	3,154	36.2	3.77	1,763	550	184,000	17.5
Clerk Typist	CCC	64	35.9	3.79	6,666	1,503	184,000	17.5
Clerk Typist	B.R.A.C.	51	80.3	6.39	7,700	3,097	184,000	17.5
Dupl. Mach. Opr.	Center	73	21.9	3.59	1,947	779	4,364	13.6
Keypunch Opr.	Center	359	42.6	3.90	2,404	971	-31,420	-9.7
Stock Clerk	CCC	85	50.5	4.11	4,817	3,046	142,000	17.4
Retail Sales Clerk	Center	433	43.6	3.51	1,215	508	405,000	17.7
Accounting Clerk	Center	276	44.9	3.91	2,085	609	94,002	13.3
Secretary	Center	69	49.2	3.50	4,409	1,189	700,000+	25.2
Bookkeeper	Center	313	38.3	3.75	2,148	633	160,000	10.8
Calc. Mach. Opr.	Center	47	34.0	3.47	1,305	596	865	17.3
Mail Clerk	AFL-CIO	38	13.1	3.39	10,046	1,092	13,405	16.7
Cashier/Checker	Center	161	34.7	3.60	1,520	545	446,000	28.7
Clerk, General	Center	590	42.4	3.89	1,340	606	366,000	15.4
Clerk, General	B.R.A.C.	62	67.0	4.45	3,556	3,158	366,000	15.4
Receptionist	Center	144	35.4	3.65	2,012	622	97,300	24.6
Teller	Center	27	40.7	3.87	1,200	430	108,000	25.3
Stenographer	Center	46	32.6	3.70	4,700	650	-25,317	-9.1
Ward Clerk	Center	180	44.1	3,73	1,575	389	366,000	15.4
Railway Clerk	B.R.A.C.	101	70.2	5.93	8,900	4,130	- 1,000	-10.6

TABLE 2

OUTCOME AND GROWTH DATA FOR JOB CORPS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

TRAINING OCCUPATION	TRAINING PROVIDER	NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENT JOB PLACED	AVERAGE WAGE OF JOB	COST PER JOB PLACEMENT	COST PER TRAINING YEAR	ABSOLUTE GROWTH	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
Service Occup.								
Custodial Maint.	Center	1,226	42.4	$ 3.92	$ 2,767	$1,068	491,000	18.3
Custodial Maint.	CCC	540	46.6	3.85	5,262	2,516	491,000	18.3
Custodial Maint.	N.A.F.B.	232	50.0	3.72	4,440	1,6[illegible]	491,000	18.3
Security Guard	Center	84	60.7	3.75	1,000	927	152,000	23.6
Teacher, Nursery	Center	124	30.6	3.40	1,606	1,245	78,056	18.0
Animal Caretaker	Center	25	56.0	4.15	3,277	3,277	19,222	12.9
Forestry/Garden								
Landscaper	Center	357	47.6	3.84	1,080	868	75,641	14.0
Forestry & Cons.	CCC	127	57.4	3.99	2,626	1,976	1,512	12.1
Pest Control	Center	42	57.1	3.76	607	633	8,087	31.6
Food Service								
Waiter/Waitress	Center	31	51.6	3.35	2,174	2,174	361,000	21.4
Cook	Center	1,940	39.2	3.45	1,737	711	86,720	25.0
Cook	CCC	646	40.6	3.87	5,169	2,687	86,720	25.0
Baker	Center	244	35.6	3.77	2,330	980	9,750	21.0
Meat Cutter	Center	71	59.1	4.05	2,321	1,037	23,923	13.5
Cook, Short Order	Center	54	62.9	3.76	1,050	2,107	93,000	21.4
Kitchen Helper	Center/CCC*	32	68.7	3.61	1,022	1,145	231,000	37.7
Auto/Mach. Rep.								
Auto Mach. Helper	Center	962	40.2	3.85	2,424	686	209,000	22.0
Auto Mach. Helper	CCC	109	47.7	3.74	3,139	1,670	209,000	22.0
Auto Service/Repairman	Center	901	47.6	3.84	1,731	750	179,000	26.0
Auto Service/Repairman	CCC	222	50.1	4.12	2,911	1,755	179,000	26.0
Auto Service/Repairman	U.A.W.	131	50.5	4.45	7,777	3,009	179,000	26.0
Small Gas Eng. Repairman	Center	67	43.2	3.60	2,971	683	20,230	13.7
Auto Body Repairman	Center	777	40.3	3.87	1,836	727	23,324	20.4
Auto Body Repairman	U.A.W.	51	70.5	4.54	5,457	3,636	23,324	20.4

19

00' 50

TABLE 2

OUTCOME AND GROWTH DATA FOR JOB CORPS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

TRAINING OCCUPATION	TRAINING PROVIDER	NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENT JOB PLACED	AVERAGE WAGE OF JOB	COST PER JOB PLACEMENT	COST PER TRAINING YEAR	ABSOLUTE GROWTH	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
Auto/Mech. Rep. (cont'd...)								
Auto Parts Clerk	Center	45	64.4	$ 3.86	$ 1,854	$ 577	685,000	27.7
Serv. Sta. Attendant.	Center	121	47.9	3.74	2,565	1,055	74,100	19.0
Serv. Stat. Attendant	AFL-CIO	30	60.0	3.69	2,147	920	74,100	19.0
Diesel Mechanic	Center	38	60.7	4.09	2,616	1,303	38,438	22.6
Heavy Equip. Repair	Center	75	40.0	4.02	8,276	2,484	10,083	11.2
Heavy Equip. Repair	I.U.O.E.	27	85.1	4.53	8,891	5,680	10,083	11.2
Construction Trades								
Carpenter Construction	Center	693	43.1	3.79	2,742	907	119,000	17.8
Carpenter Construction	N.A.H.B.	220	54.1	3.94	3,824	1,463	119,000	17.8
Carpenter Construction	U.B.C.J.A.	1,220	57.9	4.70	8,117	3,968	119,000	17.8
Electrician	Center	623	47.8	3.90	1,644	666	90,000	17.9
Electrician	N.A.H.B	149	67.8	4.13	3,791	1,859	90,000	17.9
Cement Mason	Center	52	42.3	3.68	3,018	1,185	37,090	35.9
Cement Mason	CCC	55	65.4	3.93	3,945	2,449	37,000	35.9
Cement Mason	N.A.H.B.	90	62.2	4.43	6.567	1,965	37,000	35.9
Cement Mason	OP&CMI	338	56.2	4.69	5,801	2,662	37,000	35.9
Brick/Stone Mason	Center	639	40.2	3.74	1,835	764	33,975	32.2
Brick/Stone Mason	CCC	45	62.2	4.94	3,559	1,740	33,975	32.2
Brick/Stone Mason	N.A.H.B.	88	54.6	4.02	4,879	1,436	33,975	32.2
Brick/Stone Mason	I.M.I.	539	52.6	4.53	6,060	3,092	33,975	32.2
Painter	Center	431	42.6	3.69	1,290	775	33,040	14.8
Painter	N.A.H.B.	95	58.9	4.02	2,397	1,460	33,040	14.8
Painter	I.B.P.A.T.	456	56.3	4.53	6,588	2,970	33,040	14.8
Heavy Equip. Operator	Center	227	49.3	4.36	3,956	2,063	72,663	17.3
Heavy Equip. Operator	I.U.O.E.	158	67.7	5.14	11,337	6,318	72,663	17.3
Plumber	Center	277	58.1	3.82	2,426	958	71,085	28.9
Plumber	N.A.H.B.	209	68.2	4.21	4,000	1,906	71,085	28.9
Plasterer	OP&CMI	290	56.1	4.77	6,920	2,824	1,638	10.0

TABLE 2

OUTCOME AND GROWTH DATA FOR JOB CORPS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

TRAINING OCCUPATION	TRAINING PROVIDER	NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENT JOB PLACED	AVERAGE WAGE OF JOB	COST PER JOB PLACEMENT	COST PER TRAINING YEAR	ABSOLUTE GROWTH	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
Construction Trades (cont'd...)								
Tilesetter	I.M.I.	38	68.3	$ 4.80	$ 6,313	$2,694	5,000	11.4
Const. Labor	CCC	93	55.9	3.80	5,493	3,383	250,000	10.4
Welder, Spot	Center	651	39.6	4.19	2,265	834	107,000	20.0
Welder, Spot	CCC	50	56.0	4.51	4,433	2,796	107,000	20.0
Floor Layer	Center/[illegible]	34	52.9	5.02	3,760	1,604	6,320	21.3
Insulation Worker	Center	25	52.0	3.98	1,499	487	12,977	20.6
Electrical/Appliance Repair								
Air/Cond. Ref. Mechanic	Center	345	46.1	3.72	1,873	909	30,300	20.6
Elec. Appl. Repairman	Center	183	49.5	3.13	1,643	656	3,920	7.9
Radio/TV Repairman	Center	47	42.5	3.86	2,570	619	13,386	26.2
Electrician Helper	Center	62	51.9	3.35	2,433	717	260,000	22.0
Solar Installer	N.A.H.B.	139	72.2	4.52	3,140	2,006	9,300**	10.0**
Telecommunications	AFL-CIO	56	48.2	3.76	2,214	996	11,515	15.4
Industrial Production								
Machine Operator	Center	82	70.0	4.07	1,721	883	29,000	17.1
Comb. Welder	Center	1,080	50.2	4.43	2,329	900	107,000	20.0
Comb. Welder	CCC	44	53.9	4.40	3,250	2,330	107,000	20.0
Comb. Welder	AFL-CIO	64	30.9	4.69	3,386	1,451	107,000	20.0
Sheet Metal Wkr.	Center	26	61.5	4.28	1,879	699	33,070	15.6
Furniture Upholsterer	Center	60	54.5	3.73	2,070	820	1,332	10.6
Electronics Assembler	Center	631	54.0	3.94	1,116	711	341,000	19.0
Offset Printer	Center	213	60.3	4.07	2,567	1,341	13,272	14.3
Weld, Gas Arc	Center	60	61.6	4.27	1,022	996	107,000	20.0
Machine Oper. Lathe	Center	45	57.7	3.89	2,358	1,022	29,000	16.1
Machinist	Center	87	57.4	4.27	2,325	1,006	44,288	16.1

* Data on trainees from two procurement groups were added to produce a sample of more than 25 trainees

**Statistics not available from BLS; figure shown is best estimate of Marvin [illegible], expert in labor market information

TABLE 2

OUTCOME AND GROWTH DATA FOR JOB CORPS OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING

TRAINING OCCUPATION	TRAINING PROVIDER	NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENT JOB PLACED	AVERAGE WAGE OF JOB	COST PER JOB PLACEMENT	COST PER TRAINING YEAR	ABSOLUTE GROWTH	PERCENTAGE GROWTH
Transportation								
Warehouseman	Center	180	58.3	$ 4.00	$1,080	$ 734	43,470	12.2
Forklift Operator	Center	27	66.6	4.31	1,163	837	59,356	14.9
Deckhand	I.B.U.	34	82.4	5.65	4,677	3,446	726	2.1
Health Occupations								
Nurse Assistant	Center	3,067	37.9	3.60	1,645	656	506,000	41.3
Dental Assistant	Center	87	58.7	4.02	1,957	1,082	54,300	38.6
Lic. Prac. Nurse	Center	76	53.9	5.04	4,954	1,813	177,000	36.9
Hosp. Diet Aide	Center	39	41.0	3.35	3,372	665	110,000	18.4
Medical Asst.	Center	100	41.0	3.95	3,492	974	26,447	29.8
Med. Lab. Tech.	*Center/AFL-CIO	27	18.5	3.47	5,537	814	31,000	38.4

*Data on trainees from two procurement groups were added to provide a sample of more than 25 trainees.

The selection of these measures as well as other cost measures considered is discussed in Documentation Report 4. Documentation Reports 4 and 5 discuss these outcomes in detail. The use of these outcome measures in assessing overall relative effectiveness as well as differences in training providers are summarized in Section C of this Final Report.

4. Labor Market Prospects

Table 2 also provides two measures of labor market prospects for each of the current Job Corps occupations -- absolute growth in numbers employed from 1980 to 1990 and percentage growth for the same period. When ranked in terms of the absolute growth in the number of jobs for the period 1980-1990, the top decile included several clerical, retail and medical occupations. The bottom decile had a variety of unrelated occupations. When training occupations were ranked and broken into deciles on percentage growth, the top decile contained 4 medical occupations and 3 construction occupations. The bottom decile had unrelated occupations similar to those in the absolute growth ranked list.

Documentation Reports 2 and 3 discuss the identification of high demand occupations. Documentation Report 5 and Section C of this Final Report discuss the use of labor market measures in assessing relative effectiveness of the occupations currently offered.

C. Assessment of the Relative Effectiveness of Current Occupations

One of the main purposes of the Vocational Offerings Review Project was the assess the relative or comparative effectiveness of the training occupations within Job Corps; which occupations have been more successful in the Job Corps environment and which have been less successful. The project was limited in the number and type of variables that could be used as criteria to assess relative effectiveness. The six criteria shown in Table 2 were chosen because they represent a balance between performance measures, cost measures, and future placement potential. All 80 Job Corps training occupations with more than 25 FY 1982 trainees enrolled in Job Corps for 90 or more days, were rated on (1) Job Placement Percent, (2) Average Wage at Job Entry, (3) Cost Per Training Year, (4) Cost Per Job Placement, (5) Absolute Employment Growth from 1980-1990, and (6) Percentage Employment Growth from 1980-1990. There was no attempt to measure prestige of training occupations or other value or quality-of-life oriented variables that may be related to the relative effectiveness of training occupations but that are based on value judgements.

The two cost variables, cost per job placement and cost per training year, were basic units of comparison between the training occupations within Job Corps. Use of these variables was not intended to provide a cost/benefit analysis. They were derived from dividing the total vocational training costs in each training occupation by the amount of time spent in training (training years) and the number of job placements they produce (cost per job placement). These costs did not include capital costs (equipment, facilities, etc.) or management/ support costs (administration, security, etc.) and there was no attempt to measure the difference in quality of instruction provided.

When there was more than one group providing training in an occupation, i.e., center staff, civilian conservation staff, or national contractors, data for these groups were separated to produce differing ratings for a training occupation based on the training provider. There were 108 training "occupations" rated by this analysis after the original 80 were separated by training provider.

The raw data collected in the analysis of Job Corps training occupations were used to determine a relative (comparative) assessment of individual occupations rather than an absolute judgement of each. As indicated earlier, these data were collected from 99 of the 105 current Job Corps Centers. Training occupations with too few trainees to compare adequately with larger, more established training occupations were eliminated from the analysis. The overall results (raw data) generally understated Job Corps' overall performance on these criteria because the most restricted and conservative measures of performance were used at all times. However, these artificially low numbers were used because it was not the individual performance of the training occupations but rather their effectiveness when compared to the other occupations in Job Corps which was the research issue under study.

Training occupations were scored by ranking them on each of the six criteria and awarding points from one to ten depending on how positive their ranking was on each criterion. Each of the criteria was weighted according to those considered most important for judging training occupation effectiveness in Job Corps by Job Corps national managers prior to the scoring. Figure 1 shows the weights of the six rating variables as they were assigned by the Job Corps managers.

FIGURE 1

WEIGHTS OF VARIABLES

CRITERIA	WEIGHT
1. Percent Job Placed	4
2. Average Wage of Job	1
3. Cost Per Job Placement	4
4. Cost Per Training Year	2
5. Absolute Employment Growth, 1980-1990	2
6. Percentage Employment Growth, 1980-1990	1

Rank scores (deciles) for each training occupation were multiplied by the weight assigned to each of the six ranking variables to produce a weighted score for each current Job Corps training occupation. Value judgements are inherent in any weighting system; therefore, the results of this weighting scheme were checked against scores with no weights computed. The final ranked list produced by the weighted scoring provided similar results to the ranked list produced by unweighted scoring (see Table V-C, Documentation Report No. 5). The result indicates that the weights provided by the Job Corps managers were relatively balanced between outcomes measures and cost variables; slightly less emphasis was placed on labor market projections in the weighted scheme, causing some shifts.

Table 3 presents the 108 training occupations (80 occupations separated by training provider) ranked according to their total weighted score on the rating. The mean score on this list was 78 with a standard deviation score of 18. The list was divided into upper, middle and lower groups with lines drawn to indicate scores that were more than one standard deviation above and below the mean. Some of the occupations have a dollar sign ($) or an ampersand (&) after their score. Those with the dollar sign have been flagged for having cost per job placement exceeding twice the national average of $3,076. per job placement. Those with the ampersand have been flagged for having negative growth (less than 1000) employment increase in the decade of the 1980's.

Auto Parts Clerk received the highest score based on the six weighted criteria followed by Welder, Gas Metal Arc and Forklift Operator. Of the nineteen training occupations above the upper standard deviation line, six were clerical. [illegible] the sixteen below the lower standard deviation line, six were also clerical. No clear pattern emerged about which types of training occupations were consistently more effective.

D. Assessment of the Three Groups of Training Providers

Definite differences were noted on the effectiveness criteria for National Contractors, Centers, and CCCs. Generally speaking, the National Contractors had the highest job placement rates and the highest entry wages. Contract Centers had the lowest cost per training year and cost per job placement. Civilian Conservation Centers ranked in the middle of these two groups on these four variables.

TABLE 3

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

UPPER GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
1. Auto Parts Clerk	45	Center	126
2. Welder, Gas Metal Arc.	60	Center	116
3. Forklift Operator	27	Center	113
4. Kitchen Helper*	32	Center/CCC	111
5. Electronics Ass.	631	Center	110
6. Security Guard	84	Center	109
7. Machine Operator	82	Center	108
8. Sheet Metal Worker	26	Center	108
9. Warehouseman	180	Center	106
10. Pest Control	42	Center	103
11. Retail Sales Clerk	433	Center	102
12. Insulation Worker	25	Center	101
13. Electrician	623	Center	99
14. Dental Assistant	87	Center	99
15. Cook, Short Order	54	Center	99
16. Ward Clerk	188	Center	98
17. Clerk, General	62	B.R.A.C.	98
18. Teller	27	Center	97
19. Clerk, General	598	Center	96
			X
20. Electronic Tech.	25	Center	95
21. Nurse's Assistant	3,067	Center	94
22. Auto Service/Repairer	981	Center	94
23. Auto Service/Repairer	222	CCC	93
24. Cashier/Checker	161	Center	91
25. Diesel Mechanic	28	Center	91
26. Electrician	149	N.A.H.B.	90
27. Landscaper	397	Center	89
28. Auto Mechanic Helper	562	Center	88
29. Hosp. Diet. Aide	39	Center	88
30. Clerk-Typist	3,154	Center	87
31. Brick/Stone Mason	45	CCC	87
32. Auto Body Repair	777	Center	86
33. Painter	95	N.A.H.B.	86
34. Meat Cutter	71	Center	85

X Upper Standard Deviation Line
Mean Score = 78
Standard Deviation = 18

TABLE 3

TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

MIDDLE GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
35. Combination Welder	1,880	Center	84
36. Accounting Clerk	276	Center	84
37. Machinist	87	Center	84
38. Waiter/Waitress	31	Center	84
39. Painter	431	Center	83
40. Electricial Appl.	103	Center	83
41. Machine Operator, Lathe	45	Center	83
42. Professional Program Aide	42	Center	83
43. Plumber	277	Center	81
44. Custodial Maint.	232	N.A.H.B.	80
45. Solor Installer	139	N.A.H.B.	80
46. Licensed Prac. Nurse	76	Center	80
47. Cement Mason	55	CCC	80
48. Brick/Stone Mason	639	Center	79
49. Bookkeeper	313	Center	79
50. Clerk Typist	51	B.R.A.C.	79 ($)
51. Cook	1,940	Center	78
52. Welder, Spot	601	Center	78
53. Air Cond/Ref. Mech.	245	Center	78
54. Offset Printer	213	Center	78
55. Electrician Helper	62	Center	78
56. Plumber	209	N.A.H.B.	77
57. Draftsman	160	Center	76
58. Custodial Maint.	1,226	Center	75
59. Brick/Stone Mason	88	N.A.H.B	75
60. Receptionist	144	Center	74
61. Welder, Combination	930	CCC	74
62. Auto Ser. Repair	131	U.A.W.	73 ($)
63. Ser. Stat. Atten.	121	Center	73
64. Telecommunications	56	AFL-CIO	73
65. Welder, Spot	50	CCC	73
66. Secretary	69	Center	72
67. Furniture Uphol.	60	Center	72
68. Auto Body Repair	51	U.A.W.	72
69. Carpenter Const.	693	Center	71
70. Carpenter Const.	220	N.A.H.B.	71
71. Radio/TV Repair	47	Center	71
72. Floor Layer*	34	Center/IBPAT	71

TABLE 3
TRAINING OCCUPATION RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS RANK

LOWER GROUP

TRAINING OCCUPATION EFFECTIVENESS RANK	NUMBER OF TRAINEES	TRAINING PROVIDER	TOTAL SCORE
73. Service Stat. Att.	30	AFL-CIO	70
74. Carpenter Const.	1,228	U.B.C.J.A.	69
75. Cement Mason	338	OPE/CMI	69
76. Teacher/Nursery	124	Center	69
77. Combination Welder	44	AFL-CIO	69
78. Engineer Aide/	30	I.U.O.E.	69 ($)
79. Heavy Equip. Oper.	158	I.U.O.E.	68 ($)
80. Auto Mech. Helper	109	CCC	68
81. Tilesetter	58	I.M.I.	68 ($)
82. Stock Clerk	85	CCC	67
83. Small Gas Eng. Rep.	67	Center	67
84. Calc. Mach. Oper.	47	Center	67 (&)
85. Deckhand	34	I.M.U.	67 (&)
86. Brick/Stone Mason	539	I.M.I.	65
87. Forestry/Conser.	127	CCC	64
88. Cement Mason	52	Center	64
89. Medical Assistant	100	Center	63
90. Painter	456	I.B.P.A.T.	62
91. Animal Caretaker	25	Center	62
92. Conts. Labor	93	CCC	62
93. Heavy Equip. Rep.	27	I.U.O.E.	61 ($)
94. Custodial Maint.	540	CCC	60 XX
95. Railway Clerk	101	B.R.A.C.	59 ($) (&)
96. Cook	646	CCC	57
97. Keypunch Operator	359	Center	57 (&)
98. Baker	244	Center	57
99. Heavy Equip. Oper.	227	Center	56
100. Duplicating Machine Operator	73	Center	55
101. Cement Mason	90	N.A.H.B.	54 ($)
102. Cosmetologist	67	Center	54
103. Plasterer	290	O.P.C.M.I	49 ($)
104. Medical Lab Ass't.	27	Center/AFL-CIO	47
105. Clerk-Typist	64	CCC	43 ($)
106. Stenographer	46	Center	41 (&)
107. Heavy Equip. Rep.	75	Center	31 ($)
108. Mail Clerk	38	AFL-CIO	29 ($)

*Data on trainees from two procurement groups were added together to have a smaple of more than 25 trainees.

$Cost Per Job Placement exceeds twice the National Average of #3,076.

&Projected Absolute Growth of less than 1,000 new jobs between 1980-1990.

XXLower Standard Deviation Line

TABLE C
CODE KEY FOR TRAINING PROVIDERS

CODE	EXPLANATION
AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor Congress of Industrial Organizations
B.R.A.C.	Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks
CENTER	Contract Center
CCC	Civilian Conservation Center
I.B.P.A.T.	International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades
I.M.I.	International Masonry Institute
I.M.U.	International Maritime Union
I.U.O.E.	International Union of Operating Engineers
N.A.H.B.	National Association of Homebuilders
O.P./C.M.I.	Operation Plasterers and Cement Mason's International Association
U.A.W.	United Automobile Workers
U.B.C.J.A.	United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America

When all the training occupations were scored using all six criteria as measures of relative effectiveness within Job Corps, some patterns were noted. The upper group was dominated by center trained occupations. Out of the top 34 occupations, 28 were center trained. In contrast, out of the bottom 36 occupations, only 13 were center trained. There were a disproportionate number of nationally contracted training occupations in the lower group (15 out of 27). Civilian Conservation Center programs had a similar proportion of their training occupations in the bottom group (7 out of 12) on this comparative scale. Generally, center training occupations did better than the other two groups on this set of rating criteria.

E. New High Growth Occupations

The Vocational Offerings Review Project studied labor force projections from BLS and labor market information from NOICC and BLS to choose new occupations that may be suitable for addition to Job Corps vocational offerings. All 670 occupations in BLS's publicly available projections of employment changes 1980-1990 were screened for the reading level required to learn the skills of the occupation and the length of specific vocational preparation they require. About one-half met the screening criteria and a substantial majority of these "high employment growth" occupations are currently being taught in Job Corps. The Job Corps vocational training is already fairly well targeted to labor market demand.

Occupations in which Job Corps is currently not training or is providing training to fewer than 25 corpsmembers were selected from the initial BLS list for further evaluation. Each of those occupations was evaluated using the following criteria:

(1) Absolute change in numbers employed in projected to increase 10,000 or more by 1990,

(2) Percent growth is projected to be at least 18.5% from 1980 to 1990.

(3) The occupation requires an educational level of twelfth grade or less,

(4) The occupation requires a training time of two years or less,

(5) Employer hiring practices, including age requirements and preferred education and training levels, are commensurate with corpsmember experiences and,

(6) The occupation was recommended by a panel of Job Corps employees who have knowledge of corpsmembers and of current Job Corps vocational training programs.

Occupations meeting at least five of the criteria were selected for further consideration as new Job Corps training offerings.

Table 7 lists the recommended "new" occupations. The list is not long because Job Corps is already providing training in most of the high growth occupations suited to corpsmembers' ability levels. Job Corps is currently not providing training in sixty-one occupations identified as having growth potential. Of these, twelve were identified as suitable for consideration as new Job Corps training programs.

Factors such as hiring biases in the labor market (e.g., age or educational preferences of employers), little or no training time, or inappropriateness to Job Corps environment screened out all other occupations. The recommended new occupations encompass several Job Corps training clusters.

Proposed new training offerings which appear promising in the business/ clerical program area include Word Processing Machine Operator, Data Entry Operator, Bookkeeping Machine Operator, Proof Machine Operator, and Payroll Clerk. Individuals who can operate word processing machines and perform data entry operations on computer terminals are currently in demand. Continued good job prospects are expected in the coming years. Many employers now prefer clerical applicants with word processing or data entry experience; some require it. Just as the electric typewriter superseded manual typewriters, word processing machines and computer terminals are now becoming standard office equipment. Bookkeeping Clerk occupations are expected to grow slightly faster than the average for all occupations in the coming decade. Clerks are needed to operate electronic machines and perform data entry tasks.

Possible additions to the training offerings in the Job Corps health occupations include Emergency Medical Technicians, Surgical Technicians, and X-Ray Technicians. All three occupations are expected to increase in numbers. All of these health offerings require certification or licensing on a state and/or a national level.

TABLE 4

New Job Corps Training Offerings

A. CLERICAL AND SALES CLUSTER

1. Word Processing Machine Operator
2. Data Entry Operator
3. Bookkeeping/Billing Machine Operator
4. Payroll Clerk
5. Proof Machine Operator

B. ELECTRICIAL/APPLIANCE REPAIR

1. Office Machine Repairer

C. INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

1. Production Painter

D. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS

1. Emergency Medical Technician
2. Surgical Technician
3. X-Ray Technician

E. POTENTIAL HIGH TECHNOLOGY OCCUPATIONS

1. Computer and Peripheral EDP Equipment Operator
2. Computer Service Technician

In the area of industrial production and repair, Office Machine Repairer appears to be a promising field during the coming years. As new types of office machines are being installed, they must be serviced and maintained. Also, the occupation of Industrial Production Painter is projected to increase during the 1980's. Demand for this occupation may vary according to geographic location.

Finally, possible high technology additions to Job Corps programs include the Computer Operator and Computer Service Technician Occupations. The need for computer operators is projected to increase over 70 percent in the coming decade, as more and more firms invest in computers. The training time required is within Job Corps' mandate, and opportunities for further training and advancement would be available to many people employed in this field. The need for Computer Service Technicians is also projected to increase over 70 percent in the next ten years. Opportunities for individuals who can repair and service computers appear to be excellent, and advancement potential is good.

Inasmuch as training in these computer-related occupations is likely to involve substantial training equipment capital costs, Job Corps training should be undertaken in them on a controlled experimental and demonstration basis until their viability in Job Corps is established and it can be determined how best to arrange for such training.

Specific recommendations for delivering training in these occupations are contained in Documentation Report 6.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding sections of the report have set forth the key findings on current occupational training offerings and expected growth occupations of the future. The following recommendations emerge from the findings of this study:

1. Initiate Procedures to Implement Review Findings

Based on the findings in this study, the National Office of Job Corps will ask center contractors, CCC's, and national contractors to examine their vocational training offerings. Each center, CCC and national contractor will review the training programs offered in light of the assessment of vocational offerings initiated in this review, assessment of placement potential in each occupation according to local labor market projections, and the capabilities of corpsmembers.

The occupational ranking scheme developed in this study provides two "break points" for further examination of center programs (see Table 3). First, the offerings appearing below the lower standard deviation line of the occupational ranking are open to serious question. Centers with these offerings will be required to delete the offerings unless they can submit substantial justification and a preponderance of supporting evidence for retaining the programs in any location. Those centers where offerings will be deleted, will be asked to replace them with more promising current Job Corps occupations (the top 19 on the ranked list) or with new offerings from the list contained in this study, once local and regional labor market demand has been ascertained and illustrated in support of the choices. Centers that change training offerings will respond with proposals for the occupations to be offered, except that the National Office will centrally procure standardized curricula, equipment and initial training of local instructors for selected new occupations where economies of scale achieve cost savings.

Next, the occupations appearing in the lower ranking group of all the occupations but above the standard deviation line and all other occupations that have been flagged for excessive costs or negative employment growth are the second candidates for examination. Centers with these training offerings will also be required to submit justification for the retention of these programs and present alternative training programs if performance and labor market opportunity support the need for change.

The ratings on the Job Corps occupations in this review are based on a national aggregated average of their performance according to a set of specific criteria. A low rating for a particular occupation or training provider on a national aggregated basis does not mean that each center providing that training would receive a low rating. Certain occupations may work well at a specific center or in a particular labor market. Center by center response will be elicited to confirm the performance of the occupation at each center prior to making a final recommendation to delete a specific training program.

Too, elimination of certain occupations would increase operating costs at individual centers. For example, a center offering baking as an occupation is supplied with bread products at minimal cost. Likewise, a center offering VST experience as part of the training program has some of its maintenance or construction needs met through the VST projects. These are tangible benefits to the center; however, the center must demonstrate that it operates a viable training program in terms of corpsmember job placement in order for the occupation to be retained as a training offering. Finally, exceptions to the elimination of occupations in the lower group on the ranked list would be made for certain "step-off" occupations essential in the curricula of a higher level occupation being offered.

2. Develop and Implement a System for Biennial Training Program Review

Decisions on vocational training offerings should be made through a system of national management guided by center participation. In such a system, national Job Corps management would issue biennial training program recommendations to training providers based on the type of assessment of training offerings initiated in this review. The program recommendations would be based on a list of current Job Corps training occupations which have been ranked according to performance on specified variables, such as the list contained in this study or an expanded list of variables. Improvements in MIS and cost data collection should be made to further refine the variables used in ranking the relative effectiveness of vocational offerings.

The National Office would require the centers to follow the procedures outlined in recommendation number one. Such a management approach would assure ETA that the substantial majority of Job Corps enrollees had the opportunity to be trained in occupations with the best overall performance records; that new high growth occupations would be systematically introduced into the Job Corps system; that demonstrably poor performing occupations are regularly identified, reviewed, and eliminated unless special circumstances warranted their continuation, and that Job Corps centers would retain the flexibility needed to tailor their training programs to corpsmembers' needs.

3. Develop Center Contacts with Local Labor Market Sources

In recent years, Job Corps has encouraged corpsmember enrollment at a center close to the corpsmember's home. Although not all corpsmembers remain in the state or locality of the Job Corps center where they receive their training, Job Corps should ensure that centers contact their State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and State Employment Security Agency to obtain local/state occupational supply and demand information when making decisions on vocational training. Evidence that these contacts have been made should be a part of the contracting process.

4. Conduct Follow-up Research Studies

Before conducting subsequent vocational reviews, efforts must be made to insure the standardization of any additional data that could be used to expand the scope of this study. Data collection and reporting processes must be reviewed and tested in advance of future review projects to maximize the validity and reliability of the information reported. Further efforts must be directed into exploring the issues uncovered by this initial study including the possibility that more sophisticated statistical techniques (multivariate) may be applied to the data to maximize the knowledge gained from subsequent reviews.

JOB CORPS
PERFORMANCE AND COST INDICATORS

	1984 PY EST	1984 TP EST	FY 1983	FY 1982	FY 1981	FY 1980	FY 1979	FY 1978	FY 1977
A. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS									
1. CORPSMEMBER SERVICE YEARS(CMSY)	40,544	30,400	40,085	39,526	40,887	35,600	27,944	22,892	20,586
2. NEW ENROLLEES SERVED	60,818	45,612	60,465	53,581	75,437	70,858	59,063	48,880	41,280
3. TOTAL PARTICIPANTS	102,000	86,087	87,982	97,562	114,341	104,120	84,902	70,495	62,227
4. TOTAL TERMINATIONS	60,816	45,612	56,733	60,155	70,482	65,253	51,781	44,821	40,100
5. REPORTED PLACEMENT OUTCOMES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a. EMPLOYMENT	20,300	15,300	19,760	22,985	26,116	24,507	25,841	21,837	22,314
b. EDUCATION ENTRY	11,300	8,400	9,520	11,053	9,892	6,747	6,121	6,083	7,291
c. TOTAL POSITIVE OUTCOMES (a + b)	31,600	23,700	29,280	34,038	36,008	31,254	31,962	27,920	29,605
d. RATE(% OF TERMINEES REPORTED)	70	70	75	78	76	83	86	86	86
6. ESTIMATED PLACEMENT OUTCOMES*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a. EMPLOYMENT	26,460	19,845	23,985	27,521	34,036	33,388	30,464	25,566	23,932
b. EDUCATION ENTRY	12,020	9,015	11,003	12,596	11,738	8,557	6,981	6,845	7,745
c. TOTAL POSITIVE OUTCOMES (a + b)	38,480	28,860	35,000	40,117	45,774	41,945	37,445	32,411	31,677
B. COSTS IN NOMINAL TERMS									
1. APPROPRIATION($ IN -000-)	577,500	414,000	618,000	589,600	560,700	415,700	296,000	417,000	274,100
2. TOTAL COSTS ($ IN -000-)	625,700	463,200	566,700	570,200	539,800	469,800	379,600	279,700	201,600
a. OPERATIONS	560,100	410,600	521,100	523,800	484,700	397,800	318,200	251,400	191,200
b. CAPITAL	65,600	52,600	45,600	46,400	55,100	72,000	61,400	28,300	10,400
3. OPERATIONS COST PER CMSY	13,814	13,504	13,000	13,252	11,855	11,174	11,387	10,982	9,288
4. OPERATIONS COST PER NEW ENROLLEE	9,210	9,002	8,618	9,776	6,425	5,614	5,387	5,143	4,631
5. COST PER PARTICIPANT	5,491	5,367	5,633	5,360	4,230	3,820	3,748	3,566	3,073
6. OPERATIONS COST PER PLACEMENT	14,556	14,227	15,237	13,150	10,652	9,558	8,512	7,758	6,040
C. COSTS - ADJUSTED TO 1984 DOLLARS	964	1,000	1,047	1,095	1,172	1,287	1,406	1,527	1,640
1. APPROPRIATION ($ IN -000-)	556,710	414,000	647,046	645,600	657,100	535,000	416,200	636,000	450,000
2. TOTAL COSTS ($ IN -000-)	603,175	463,200	598,256	624,400	632,700	604,600	533,700	427,100	330,700
a. OPERATIONS	539,936	410,600	545,592	573,600	568,100	512,000	447,400	383,900	313,600
b. CAPITAL	63,238	52,600	52,664	50,800	64,600	92,600	86,300	43,200	17,100
3. OPERATIONS COST PER CMSY	13,317	13,504	13,611	14,511	13,894	14,381	16,010	16,770	15,232
4. OPERATIONS COST PER NEW ENROLLEE	8,878	9,002	9,023	10,705	7,530	7,226	7,574	7,853	7,595
5. COST PER PARTICIPANT	5,293	5,367	5,323	5,870	4,958	4,917	5,270	5,446	5,040
6. OPERATIONS COST PER PLACEMENT	14,032	14,227	14,051	14,400	12,484	12,301	11,968	11,846	9,906

* MOST JOB CORPS ENROLLEES RECEIVE THEIR TRAINING AWAY FROM THEIR COMMUNITIES. THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISPERSION OF TERMINEES MAKES IT DIFFICULT FOR STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AGENCIES TO LOCATE AND REPORT ON MANY OF THEM. THE ESTIMATION PROCEDURE IS BASED ON THE REPORTED EXPERIENCE OF TERMINEES WHO PLACED THEMSELVES, AND REPRESENTS A CONSERVATIVE ASSUMPTION.

PROFILE OF THE "TYPICAL" JOB CORPS ENROLLEE

The "typical" or average Job Corps enrollee is an economically disadvantaged youth, 18 years of age, male (63%), minority (71%), high school dropout, reads at the 6th grade level, has never been employed full time (75%), comes from either a family receiving public assistance or one earning $5,389 per year, and was living in an environment characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife, or other disorienting conditions impairing his (her) ability to successfully participate in other programs providing needed training, education or assistance.

Attachment

CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB CORPS ENROLLEES ENTERING IN FY 1983

Age at Entry (Average: 18)

15-16	14.1%
17	19.2
18	21.4
19	20.3
20	14.6
21	10.4

Sex

Male	62.6%
Female	37.4

Race-Ethnic Group

Black	56.0%
White	28.5
Hispanic	9.1
Amer. Indian	3.6
Asia-Pacific	2.8

Entry Reading Level (Average: Grade 6)

Under Grade 3	8.7%
Grade 3-4	19.2
Grade 5-6	22.2
Grade 7-8	29.8
Above Grade 8	20.2

Never Employed Full-Time: 75.0%

Families on Public Assistance: 38.3%

Estimated Annual Family Income (Average: $5,389)
(Excluding families receiving Public Assistance)

Under $3,000	36.1%
$3,000-$6,999	26.4
$7,000-$8,999	15.3
$9,000 & Over	22.2

Family Size (Average: 4)

1 person	25.4%
2-4	35.1
5 and over	39.5

Job Corps Performance and Costs
Cost Data (by Budget Category and Unit Costs)

Please provide cost data for Fiscal Years 1982, 1983 and 1984 including New Obligational Authority, budget category (including capital funds) and unit costs for each year.

The following information is provided:

COST SUMMARY

	FY 1982	FY 1983	Transition 1984	Program Year 1984
Appropriation (NOA $ in 000)	589,600	618,000	414,900	577,500
Total Costs	570,200	566,700	463,200	625,700
Operations Cost Per Corpsmember Service Year	13,252	13,000	13,504	13,814

DETAILED BREAKOUT OF COST BY BUDGET CATEGORY
($ in 000)

CATEGORY	FY 1982	FY 1983	Transition 1984	Program Year 1984
Corpsmember Transportation	6,600	7,100	5,200	7,200
Corpsmember Pay & Allowances	75,300	74,400	55,900	74,600
Outreach, Placement, Support	22,900	22,300	18,800	24,600
Center Operations	411,700	414,500	328,000	449,900
National Mgmt. Systems	5,100	800	1,000	1,500
National Admin. Expenses	2,200	2,000	1,700	2,300
TOTAL PROGRAM OPERATIONS	523,800	521,100	410,600	560,100
Construction and Rehab Costs*	INA	16,600	23,700	31,800
Capital Equipment	INA	3,900	6,200	5,300
Vehicles	INA	2,400	2,400	3,300
Voc. Skills Trng. Materials	INA	9,800	10,300	11,500
Architect & Engineer Support	INA	7,700	6,400	8,700
Center Leases	INA	5,200	3,600	5,000
TOTAL CAPITAL	46,400	45,600	52,600	65,600
GRAND TOTAL	570,200	566,700	463,200	625,700
* Construction and Rehab Obligations		26,700	35,700	23,300
- Health		18,800	17,800	17,400
- Other Const/Rehab		-	2,000	600
- Center Relocations		7,900	15,900	5,300

UNIT COSTS (COSTS PER CORPSMEMBER YEAR) FOR PROGRAM OPERATIONS

CATEGORY	FY 1982	FY 1983	Transition 1984	Program Year 1984
Corpsmember Transportation	167	177	172	178
Corpsmember Pay & Allowances	1,905	1,856	1,838	1,839
Outreach, Placement, Support	579	556	618	607
Center Operations	10,416	10,341	10,787	11,096
National Mgmt. Systems	129	21	33	37
National Admin. Expenses	56	49	56	57
TOTAL OPERATIONS UNIT COST	13,252	13,000	13,504	13,814

Mr. O'Keefe. One of the things that is built into the study is that it will be a continuing examination of the vocational offerings in the Job Corps. This was not a one-time activity. I think the results of it demonstrate to us the need to build it into the overall operation on a continuing basis.

The Chairman. OK. To what extent are students hindered upon entering Job Corps by inadequate grounding in the basic courses such as reading, writing, and mathematics?

Mr. O'Keefe. We put a profile into the record.

Peter?

Mr. Rell. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As the profile of a typical Job Corps youth really shows, the average reading level of an entering enrollee is the sixth grade level. Approximately 90 percent of the individuals are high school dropouts. The Job Corps participants are those who have not faired well in our regular school system. They have, for the most part, dropped out and have not gained the kind of academic skills that are necessary to compete in today's labor market, which is why the Job Corps Program design calls for a combination of basic education and vocational skills training, because the two go hand in hand.

I suspect that if our youngsters had their druthers, they would just go to vocational training and not go to the classroom, but we require them to do both because they do come in a deficient educational status.

The Chairman. S. 2111 made several specific suggestions regarding performance standards, such as the number of students who have earned their general equivalency diplomas, et cetera. What standards has the Labor Department considered for use in evaluating Job Corps contractors and programs?

Mr. O'Keefe. Mr. Chairman, to date we have developed four standards, and these standards were not developed within the Employment and Training Administration alone. We had considerable input from those involved in the operating of the program, including our two sister agencies, Agriculture and Interior.

We have at the present time, as I said, four standards that we will be implementing this spring. Two of them deal with the retention rates in the program. The third one deals with the placement rate of terminees who have been retained in the program for at least 180 days. The fourth one is a process indicator having to deal with significant incidents that occur at the centers.

We are also in the process of reviewing additional performance indicators which will permit us to assess the individual center.

We can submit for the record, sir, a summary of the performance standards.

The Chairman. I would be happy to have that. We will make that part of the record.

[Material supplied for the record follows:]

DRAFT

DIRECTIVE: Job Corps Bulletin No.

TO: ALL REGIONAL DIRECTORS
USDA and USDI CONSERVATION AGENCY
ALL JOB CORPS CENTER DIRECTORS

FROM: PETER E. RELL
Director
Office of Job Corps

SUBJECT: Establishment of Performance Stardards for
Job Corps Centers

1. Purpose. To establish policy, guidelines and requirements for implementing performance standards for Job Corps center operators.

2. Reference. 20 CFR 684.23 and .134.

3. Background. Over the years, Job Corps has used various approaches to monitor and assess performance of center operators. During recent years, center reviews and the performance measurement system (PMS) have served as the key processes through which management oversight and assessment activities have been conducted. During Fiscal Year 1982, the Office of Job Corps initiated a joint effort with the Office of Performance Management to develop formal performance standards which would measure center operators' achievements as they relate to overall objectives of the program, and which could be consistently applied and formally incorporated into the review and procurement processes. This Bulletin announces the establishment of standards for center operators which will provide a formalized, objective framework for assessing and improving the effectiveness of Job Corps centers on an on-going basis.

The initial performance standards have been developed through an extensive participatory effort involving each major segment of the Job Corps program, including national and regional office staff, center directors, corporate and support contractor representatives, and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. The developmental process was conducted through use of a Technical Work Group (TWG) which prepared initial recommendations and explored alternatives for establishing measures, and an Advisory Committee which directed and reviewed the work of the TWG and made final decisions on the selection of measures and their application to center operators.

The process focused on identification and selection of measures, the methodology for setting standards, and the application of standards to center operators. Discussions regarding selection of initial standards involved identifying measures which (1) would reflect the objectives of the program; (2) would be reflective of program outcomes which were considered to be substantially within the control of the center operator; and (3) were measurable (i.e., data was available or readily obtainable). A statistical contractor was used to identify those factors affecting performance which were beyond the center operator's control to account for differences between centers and establish expected levels of performance which would be unique to each center based on characteristics of corpsmembers served, local economic factors, and other center factors.

A listing of Technical Papers which describe the process in substantial technical detail is included in Attachment 1. Copies are available from the Job Corps National Office upon request.

The resulting initial standards represent Phase I of an evolving process. The standards will be utilized to determine the relative success of each center operator and establish a mechanism to direct the program as a whole towards improved performance. Phases II and III will focus on the development of measures which will more completely reflect a center's impact on corpsmembers in terms of "employability enhancement" (e.g., reading gains, vocational skills attainment, etc.) Phase II, which will be on-going through Fiscal Year 1984, will focus on developing interim employability enhancement measures relating to vocational completions and reading gains. Phase III is a longer term research effort that will focus on formulating more sophisticated methods for measuring corpsmembers' educational attainment, vocational skills acquisition, and social skills development.

4. Policy. Performance standards will constitute the formal process for planning and assessing each center's overall level of effectiveness in serving its corpsmembers. The standards provide the basis for negotiating planned levels of performance with each center and for monitoring actual progress of the center. For contract centers, the standards will be incorporated into the procurement process and will be treated as a contractual obligation. Performance assessments will be an integral part of the decision process in the exercise of option years and in evaluating contractor's past performance as an input to the competitive procurement process. For civilian conservation centers, performance standards will be established and assessed on a program year basis in accordance with application procedures agreed to

by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. For all centers, assessments of performance against standards will be utilized to identify any areas requiring corrective action by the center operator.

5. Standards. Initial (Phase I) performance standards include three numerical measures and one process standard relating to how centers handle significant incidents. The standards established are:

a. 90 Day Retention Rate

The number of terminees (including transferees received) who were enrolled for 90 days or more divided by total terminees (including transferees received).

b. 180 Day Retention Rate

The number of terminees (including transferees received) who were enrolled for 180 days or more divided by total terminees (plus transferees received).

c. Placement Rate of Terminees Staying 180 Days

The number of terminees who were enrolled for 180 days or more and who were placed divided by the total number of terminees who had been enrolled for 180 days or more. (Placement includes a corpsmember's entry into regular employment, OJT, apprenticeship program, school or other non-wage paying institutional training programs, or the Armed Forces.)

d. Handling of Significant Incidents

The prevention, handling, and reporting of Type I significant incidents at each center shall be accomplished in accordance with the procedures described in JCB 84-8 and 20 CFR 684.70, 71, 133 (j) and (k).

For each of the numerical measures, individualized standards will be established for each center through the use of analytical models. These statistical models are constructed to provide a basis for setting planned levels of center performance taking into account those factors which are beyond the control of the center operator. These factors include differences in corpsmember demographics, center configuration, and economic conditions. (A more detailed description of this methodology is included in Attachment 2.)

Handling of significant incidents is a process standard which will be assessed on a "pass/fail" basis in accordance with procedures and requirements established in Job Corps Bulletin 84-8 and subsequent amendments.

6. Process for Setting Center Standards. The analytical model for each of the numerical standards is presented in Attachment 3. The worksheets show the local factors taken into account for the particular standard, the national average experience value for each factor, and the relative weights for each. Instructions are provided on how to calculate the expected performance for the center and establish minimum and maximum ranges while taking into account corpsmember

characteristics, center configuration, etc. The worksheets will be completed using the last 12 months of actual experience data for the center.

The initial calculation of the standards based on the most recent year's experience implicitly assumes that corpsmember characteristics, etc., for future periods will be consistent with recent experience. However, prior to making a determination as to whether a contract center or civilian conservation center met its standards, the center's standards will be recalculated using the most current data available to take into account any changes between planned and actual experience on demographic, economic, or center factors. This will ensure that assessments of a center's performance are made on a fair and equitable basis reflecting the actual experience of the center in terms of the type of input it actually received, actual economic conditions, etc. The second factor influencing the level of each standard, is the weight assigned to each variable in the statistical model. For contract centers, the weights assigned to each variable will be in place for the two year base period of the contract. Updated coefficients provided by the National Office will be used in the calculation of standards for contract option years and for each program year for civilian conservation centers. The reference point--national average experience values--will also be updated annually to pick up any significant changes in overall program performance. Acceptable ranges of performance will be revised annually to maintain a balance of expected performance levels which will result in approximately 25%

of all center operators falling below minimum levels, 25% exceeding maximum levels, and the remaining 50% falling in the middle.

It should be noted that the statistical models for the two retention measures (90-day and 180-day) were developed utilizing enrollee-based data, e.g., the number of enrollees who remained in the program for 90 days or more divided by the total number of enrollees who could have stayed at least 90 days. These models were developed in accordance with guidance provided during the last Advisory Committee meeting, based on their assessment that there could be potential time-lag problems using terminee-based data (i.e., a center would not receive credit for corpsmembers who stayed 90 or 180 days until after they terminated).

After more careful reflection, however, it was determined that utilizing enrollee-based data had some drawbacks. It would be extremely difficult for center operators to monitor their own performance since they do not maintain nor have access to records on an "enrollee" basis. Therefore, although the initial models were developed using enrollee-based data, performance assessments will be done using termination-based data, and the definitions of the measures have been revised accordingly. This will not create a problem relating to time-lags in reporting since center operators will receive credit for "carry-over" enrollees from one contract period to another. (It is anticipated that a terminee-based model will be available for initial implementation, and future updates of the analytical models will be developed utilizing terminee-based data.)

7. Application

a. Contract centers: Performance standards will be included in all Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for center operations. Any proposal submitted in response to an RFP must show planned performance that is at least equal to the minimum of the expected range for each standard. Procurement review panels will look at the offeror's planned performance in rating proposals, as well as evaluating offeror's past experience in relation to performance standards under the Past Performance criterion. Determinations on exercise or non-exercise of option years will be based on a current review of the center operator's performance against the standards coupled with an assessment of the contractor's compliance with all other terms and conditions of the contract as discussed in Section 8, Performance Assessments. RFP and contract language will specify that standards will be calculated and updated in accordance with the process described in this bulletin (see Section 6).

b. Civilian conservation centers: Performance standards for civilian conservation centers will be the same as those applied to contract centers, but they will be applied and assessed on a program year basis.

8. Performance Assessments

a. General: From a statistical standpoint, the critical determination is whether the center operators' actual performance on each of the three numerical measures meets or exceeds the calculated range of expected performance. If the center operator's performance on a given measure falls below the minimum of the predicted range, the center has failed to meet that standard. If the center operator's performance meets or exceeds the minimum value in the range, the standard has been met. Should the center operator's performance meet or exceed the maximum value in the predicted range, the center has achieved superior performance on that standard.

A center operator's performance on each of the three numerical measures will be combined to produce an overall rating of unacceptable, acceptable, or superior. This will be done through assigning a numerical value to the actual performance level achieved for each standard:

Performance	Value
Center operator does not meet minimum	0
Center operator meets minimum but does not meet or exceed maximum	1
Center operator meets or exceeds maximum	2

The combined scores will be applied as follows:

- If the center operator falls below the minimum on at least two of the three numerical standards (combined score of 0-1), it is deemed to have failed to meet the standards overall.

- If the center operator meets or exceeds the minimum on at least two of the three standards (combined score of 2-4), it is deemed to have met the standards overall. (Note: It is possible to have a combined score of 2 and fail to meet standards overall if one standard has been exceeded and two have not been met).
- If the center operator's performance meets or exceeds the maximum on at least two of the three measures and at least meets the minimum of the third (combined score of 5-6), it is deemed to have achieved superior performance overall.

b. Judgmental Criterion: While the assessments will be utilized to determine whether a center operator's performance has been unacceptable, acceptable, or superior, in relation to the standards, judgment must come into play in making final determinations. As indicated in Section 8-c. below, an opportunity will be provided to center operators who fail to meet standards to submit evidence to the Regional Director or Agency, as appropriate, to substantiate reasons for the performance shortfall. This would include a variety of special situations which are clearly beyond the control of the center operator, including:

- a major fire or other severe damage to center facilities

- outbreak of serious health problems
- center closings or relocations
- significant processing delays in assignment of new enrollees
- radical, unplanned change in enrollee composition of a center (e.g., influx of refugees)

In such cases, evidence submitted by the center operator, an analysis of performance trends, and findings from the most recent center review will be utilized to make a final determination on acceptability or non-acceptability of the center operator's performance in relation to the standards.

c. Contract centers: Job Corps now awards contracts for center operations for a base two-year period, with three one-year options which may be exercised by the Government. It has, therefore, been determined that the contract year is the most practical and appropriate period to be used in assessing a center's performance against its standards. Assessments will occur as follows:

(1) End of first year: At the end of the first year of the base contract period, the Regional Director will review the center's performance using the most current data available. A findings letter will be sent to the contractor by the end of the 13th month (approximately) indicating the results of the assessment. Contractors not meeting the minimum level of performance will be informed of the shortfall and directed to take corrective action. Center operators will be responsible for monitoring their own performance on

an on-going basis and submitting written evidence of any extenuating circumstances contributing to the performance shortfall within 30 days of the findings letter.

(2) End of first 16 months: The Regional Director will conduct a follow-up assessment of the center operator's performance against recalculated standards (see Section 6) at the end of the 16th month (approximately) of the base two-year period. If the contractor has submitted no written explanation for any existing performance shortfalls by the time of this assessment, it will be assumed there were no mitigating circumstances contributing to the shortfall during the period under review. The results of this assessment will be considered in the decision process for awarding option years along with other information on compliance with contractual provisions (including the work statement) available from the most recent center review, monitoring, audit reports, investigations, etc.

(a) If the contractor has failed to meet the standards overall, the Regional Director will review any evidence submitted by the contractor and make a decision as to whether or not the shortfall is due to extenuating circumstances. If a determination is made that extenuating cicumstances did negatively affect the contractor's performance, the option year decision will be made taking this into account, considering performance trends, and following an assessment of the contractor's overall performance relative to all terms and conditions of the contract. If the Regional Director determines the shortfall is unacceptable (i.e., was not caused by factors beyond the contractor's control), the contractor will be informed by the end of the 17th month (approximately) that an option year will not be exercised and the RFP process will be initiated.

(b) If the contractor has met the standards overall, the Regional Director will consider the contractor's performance against standards, proposed option year price, and performance relative to other terms and conditions of the contract to make a decision on whether or not to exercise the option year and notify the contractor of this decision.

(c) If the contractor's performance against standards has been superior overall, proposed option year costs are determined to be reasonable, and all other terms and conditions of the contract have been met, the Regional Director will notify the contractor that the option year will be exercised.

(3) Additional option year assessments: At approximately four months into each option year, the Regional Director will assess the center operator's performance against recalculated standards (following the procedures outlined in (2) above) to determine whether an additional option year will be exercised. A findings letter will be issued within 30 days of the assessment. Again, the contractor is

responsible for monitoring its own performance and submitting evidence of extenuating circumstances if performance shortfalls exist or are anticipated. Contractor input must be submitted before the end of the fourth month of each option year so that the Regional Director can consider it on a timely basis.

d. Conservation Centers: In accordance with the new JTPA planning cycle, the agencies will develop program operating plans for their centers on a program year basis beginning in 1985. It has, therefore, been determined that the program year is the most practical and appropriate period to be used in assessing civilian conservation centers performance against standards. Assessments of performance against recalculated standards for each conservation center will be cmpleted by the end of the first quarter of the following program year. Results of these assessments, development of corrective action plans and followup assessments will be handled in accordance with interagency procedures.

e. Sample Results: FY 1982 center performance levels against each of the numerical standards are included in Attachment 4 to illustrate how application of the statistical model will work. It should be noted that this illustration uses fiscal year data (not contract period data) and does not show the minimum and maximum range calculations. The minimum and maximum performance ranges for each center can be calculated using the model worksheets shown in Attachment 3.

on Fiscal Year 1983 data.

10. Responsibilities

a. National Office. The National Office shall be responsible for establishing overall policy regarding performance standards; for providing updated coefficients for calculation of standards; and for providing annual national average experience values.

b. Regional Offices. Job Corps Regional Offices shall be responsible for negotiating performance standards with each center operator, monitoring performance against standards, evaluating evidence submitted by contractors who are experiencing performance shortfalls, and considering performance assessments in procurement and contract administration activities.

c. Agencies. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior shall be responsible for implementing performance standards with their respective centers, monitoring performance, and recommending corrective actions as required.

d. Centers. Center operators shall be responsible for monitoring their own progress against standards on an on-going basis and for providing timely documentation on any performance shortfalls caused by circumstances outside their immediate control.

11. Action Required. Regional Directors, Agencies and center operators shall comply with the requirements and procedures established in this Bulletin in accordance with the implementation schedule established in Section 9.

12. Inquiries. Inquiries should be directed to Jan Gulledge, 8-376-2646. Agencies direct inquiries to DA/FS Millard Mitchell, 382-1649 or DI/OVP Ben Murdock, 343-8086.

Attachment 1 - List of Technical Papers
Attachment 2 - Description of Methodology
Attachment 3 - Worksheets and Instructions
Attachment 4 - Illustration of the Application of Performance Standards Using FY 82/83 Data
Attachment 5 - RFP Language

ATTACHMENT #1

LIST OF TECHNICAL PAPERS FOR JOB CORPS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Date	Title and related items
May 1982	"Approach and Options for Establishing Job Corps Performance Standards"; TWG report (47pp)
June 1982	"Technical Paper No. 1: Recruitment/Screening"; TWG paper (4pp)
June 1982	"Technical Paper No. 2: Performance Measures and Accounting for Differences for Job Corps Centers and Placement Contractors"; TWG paper (16pp)
June 1982	"Technical Paper No. 3: Principles for Application of Job Corps Performance Standards"; TWG paper (16pp)
June 1982	"Technical Paper No. 4: Interim Findings and Recommendations on Selected Short and Long Term Tasks Related to Residential Living, Community Relations, Education, and Vocational Training Components of Job Corps"; TWG paper (20pp)
July 1982	"Progress Report: Development of Job Corps Performance Standards"; ETA staff paper (20pp)
May 1983	"Technical Paper No. 5: Selection of Performance Measures for Establishing Job Corps Center Standards"; TWG paper (13pp)
May 1983	"Technical Paper No. 6: Methodology for Establishing Job Corps Performance Standards"; TWG paper (19pp)
August 1983	"Technical Paper No. 7: Performance Standards for Job Corps Centers"; ETA staff paper (67pp)

ATTACHMENT #2

DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY USED IN SETTING PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe the basic statistical approach that has been selected to establish performance standards for Job Corps centers. This paper offers a general summary of why this methodology was selected and how it is being used in setting individualized standards for each center on the three numerical performance measures defined in the accompanying Job Corps Bulletin. More detailed treatment of related subject areas can be found in the technical papers referenced in Attachment #1.

Background

Agreement was reached early in the project that a number of factors beyond the control of center operators do influence performance and, therefore, ought to be taken into account in formulating performance standards for the centers. The relationship of such factors to center performance could be explored through a statistical technique termed regression analysis. This technique provides the basis for specifying the degree of relationship between these factors and the performance measure. Accordingly, project work focused on constructing a statistical model based on regression analysis that would incorporate several key aspects:

- Utilization of data elements and sources available in the Job Corps information systems and other official sources;
- Inclusion of only those local factors that are outside management control and which are statistically determined to have a bearing on performance; and
- Development of a methodology to adjust for differences between centers on the local factors selected.

These main aspects were carefully considered by the Technical Work Group and by the Advisory Committee in their deliberations and recommendations. Based on this policy guidance, local factors were identified, analyzed, and tested which might be included in the model together with developing a methodology for adjusting center differences.

Use of Available DataBases

The existing Job Corps information system was found to contain an excellent array of data elements for use in standards setting. Specifically, the Job Corps Mainstream and Placement reporting processes provide complete demographic and outcome data on all corpsmembers entering or terminating during FY 1982 and into FY 1983. Thus, this Job Corps database in combination with other data sources furnishes highly useful data elements in three main categories of information:

- Enrollee characteristics and termination outcomes,
- Center characteristics, and
- Home State socio-economic characteristics.

Corpsmember characteristics data include age, sex, race, education, reading scores, family status, etc. Center characteristics data include type of center (contract vs. CCC), authorized capacity, and configuration (male/female, resident/commuter). Special supplementary data on current condition of center facilities was obtained through a recent survey conducted by the Office of Job Corps. Socio-economic characteristics include the following items on the enrollee's home state: population, unemployment rate, average annual payroll per employee, percentages of labor force participation and for manufacturing and service industries, etc.

Criteria for Local Factors

An essential step in building the performance model is to select the specific data elements to be used in developing the adjustment methodology. The basic criteria for determining whether a local factor should be included were as follows:

- The local factor is readily quantifiable and based on available data sources.
- The local factor has a statistically significant relationship to performance outcomes for corpsmembers.
- The local factor should pass a common-sense test (i.e. be intuitively correct) regarding its anticipated relationship to performance measures.
- The local factor actually makes a difference in predicting performance.
- The local factor needs to be included to satisfy appropriate policy reasons.

Using the methodology described below, an extensive examination was conducted using the available data sources. The aim of this statistical analysis was to determine the extent of relationship (coefficients) that corpsmember characteristics and other data elements have on corpsmember success in the program. Corpsmember success against each performance measure can then be the basis for predicting and assessing the performance of each center.

Selection of Methodology -- Center or Individual Level

At the outset of the project, the initial expectation was that the approach selected would compare performance based on program-level statistics (i.e. center level), which is being used in most other ETA programs for performance standards purposes. However, the availability of a rich database on individual Job Corps enrollees permitted consideration and adoption of another approach by the Advisory Committee. The approach is termed "analysis by covariance" and is based on individual corpsmember characteristics and outcomes. There are a variety of reasons why the analysis by covariance approach was selected as the preferred statistical approach for the center performance model:

- The information directly available from the Job Corps database expands some 100 center observations to tens of thousands of individual corpsmember observations.
- No information is lost when the individual data is aggregated to the center level or to the national level.
- Corpsmember based observations are invariably more plausible for Job Corps center operators and managers.
- The coefficients for local factors are more reliable and less likely to be biased when based on corpsmember data and are expected to remain more stable over periods of time.
- The full influence of particular variables can be examined since it is possible to model the relationship between known actual individual performance and individual explanatory factors.
- Many more local factors can be included in the model and, as a consequence, this helps to assure that the coefficients are more likely to be valid.

Another important advantage of this methodology is that it can examine the interrelationships of multiple variables in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

model. In other words, taking separate looks at race and reading score and welfare status may involve some duplication of influence indicated in each of these. What analysis by covariance does is to estimate this interrelationship among the variables in the model and take it into consideration in determining the coefficients. By estimating the influence of different combinations of variables on performance, this methodology enables the effect of that difference to be used in predicting the performance of the center for a particular measure.

Analyzing and Testing the Methodology

The analysis by covariance approach uses all of the information available about individual corpsmembers and aggregates such characteristics and performance data up to the level of the centers with which they are affiliated. This methodology models and develops expectations against each performance measure (e.g. 90 day enrollee retention rate, 180 day enrollee retention rate, an placement rate for enrollees staying 180 days).

Using this methodology, the performance model can be constructed so that it can adjust center performance expectations for each measure based on the selected local factors covering enrollee characteristics, center characteristics, and home state socio-economic characteristics. This means that individualized standards can be established for each center for each measure.

As a result of extensive analysis and testing, it was possible to determine those factors having the most significant influence on predicting the several performance measures. More importantly, such analysis and testing provided the basis for resolving questions as to which local factors would be included and others dropped. Many variables were explored in the process of framing the performance model. These were tested to ascertain whether the difference in performance associated with a particular variable depended on the presence or absence of another variable.

During this testing, the model was trimmed according to the criteria for selecting local factors outlined earlier in this paper. Reasons for excluding a variable or comparison depended on the strength of the given variable or comparison. In the case of the enrollee retention rates where data pertained directly to individuals, differences larger than about two percent were considered to be statistically significant and the variable was included. For the placement rate, differences as small as about three percent were retained in the model.

Final Models

The worksheets for each performance measure (see Attachment #3) represent the final models developed through the use of the statistical methodology described in this paper. As will be

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

noted, these worksheets contain local factors reflecting a sizeable proportion of data elements based on basic corpsmember characteristics. Likewise, the worksheets continue to include most of the previously identified home state socio-economic data. The center characteristics factors have been augmented by several variables based on the recent survey of current center facility conditions.

The comparative number of local factors by cluster that appear on the worksheets for the three numerical measures is summarized below.

Local Factor Cluster	ENROLLEE 90 Day	RETENTION 180 Day	PLACEMENT RATE
CORPSMEMBER CHARACTERISTICS	23	23	13
HOME STATE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA	5	5	6
CENTER CHARACTERISTICS	8	8	3
Totals	36	36	22

In addition to a copy of the model worksheet for each performance measure, Attachment #3 to the accompanying Job Corps Bulletin also contains instructions for completing items on the worksheets.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment #3A

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING JOB CORPS CENTER PERFORMANCE STANDARDS WORKSHEETS

General There are five separate sections in Attachment #3. The first part is this section (#3A) which provides basic information and instructions regarding the other four parts. As will be noted, the second section (#3B) is an example of a worksheet filled out for the STAY180 rate using one center's data for FY 1982. The next three parts are facsimile copies of the worksheets for each of the three numerical performance standards:

#3C	90 Day Retention Rate,
#3D	180 Day Retention Rate, and
#3E	Placement Rate for 180 Day Stayers.

The following information and instructions are furnished for purposes of assisting in completing the worksheets. This part also includes the sources of data and computation methods for items on the worksheets. No information is shown for certain items that are considered self-explanatory as they appear.

Item A NAME OF JOB CORPS CENTER

Be sure this is shown on each worksheet.

Item B NAME OF CONTRACTOR/AGENCY

Enter center operator's name unless the worksheet is being prepared for an RFP in which case this item should be left blank.

Item C CONTRACT NUMBER

Item D CONTRACT PERIOD

Enter the current period of the contract for the contractor cited in Item B. above or the anticipated contract period if the worksheet is being completed for an RFP.

Item E TYPE OF CALCULATION/DATE

Indicate whether the calculation is being done for an RFP or for a performance review of an existing center operator. If the calculation is for a performance review, be sure to show the time period under review. The date of the calculation should be shown in the space indicated.

Item F PERFORMANCE MEASURE

This name is preprinted for convenience in completing the sheets.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item G LOCAL FACTOR SUMMARY

The detailed data for this item is extracted from the reverse side of the form once all columns have been calculated. The local factors which constitute the performance model for the particular measure have been preprinted. These local factors shown to influence center performance levels are grouped into three clusters as shown. The sub-totals for each cluster should be entered in the blank indicated along with the total at the bottom.

Column (a) Actual for Previous Period

Enter the actual values for each factor during the most recent one year period for the center.

Column (b) Current Period Planned Values

The values shown for factors are expected to reflect actual experience of the center during the previous period except when policy direction provided by the Office of Job Corps indicates there should be a change. If the worksheet is being completed for an RFP, enter the planned values as anticipated. When the worksheet is for a performance review, the recalculation is to be based on the actual values for each local factor during the performance period under review.

Column (c) National Average Factor Values

This data has been preprinted for convenience in completing the worksheets.

Column (d) Difference (b) - (c)

Enter the result of subtracting Column (c) data for each local factor from Column (b) data for the same local factor.

Column (e) Weights

This data has been preprinted for convenience in completing the worksheets.

Column (f) Effects of Local Factors

Enter the net result of multiplying Column (d) data for each individual local factor times Column (e) for the same factor and post in Column (f). Compute the sub-total for each cluster in the space indicated. Enter overall total at bottom of the page. The sub-totals and overall total shown be entered as instructed under Item G on the front side of the form.

Item H NATIONAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE LEVEL

This data has been preprinted for convenience in completing the worksheets.

Item I PREDICTED CENTER PERFORMANCE LEVEL

This figure is calculated by taking the + or - factor found in the "TOTAL" space under Item G and adding it to the "NATIONAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE LEVEL" found in Item H above.

Item J PREDICTED PERFORMANCE RANGE ADJUSTMENT

This figure has been preprinted for convenience in completing the worksheets for each measure. The process for setting acceptable performance ranges is explained in the Job Corps Bulletin.

Item K INITIAL PLANNED PERFORMANCE LEVEL

Compute the minimum and maximum levels using the data from Items I and J and enter in the places indicated.

Item L RECALCULATED PERFORMANCE STANDARD

If the worksheet is being completed for a performance review, enter the recalculated minimum and maximum as computed from changes between planned and actual experience on corpsmember characteristics, center configuration, or home state economic conditions.

Additional Information on Local Variables and Data Sources

The following information has been included in order to indicate the reference groups used for the various local factors. The reference groups specified below are not shown on the worksheet. Other explanations are added to facilitate the understanding and use of these worksheets.

AGE	% Age 15-16 is the reference group for the retention rates and % Age 17 or above is the reference group for the placement rate.
SEX	% Male (or not indicated) is the reference group on this factor for all three measures.
RACE	% Black (or don't know) is the reference group on this factor for the two retention rates. On the Placement Rate, the reference group on this factor is % White (or don't know).
BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION NEEDED	The reference group here is the % No Need (or don't know) as used for the retention rates.
YEARS OF SCHOOLING	For the retention rates, the reference group on this factor is % 0-8 yrs. schooling pre-JC (or don't know). For the placement rate, the reference group is % Less than 12 yrs schooling.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FAMILY SIZE	On the two retention measures, the reference group for this factor is % Family Size 1 - 3.
FAMILY HEAD	% Other (or don't know) is the reference group on this factor for the two retention rates. This variable is framed somewhat differently on the Placement Rate with the factor shown on the form being % Corpsmembers Dependent and the reference group being % Corpsmembers Head of Household/Independent.
DEPENDENTS	For the two retention measures, the reference group on this variable is % No Dependents (or don't know).
READING SCORE	% RJS Reading scores 0-6 (or don't know) is the reference group on this variable for the two retention rates. The reference group on this factor for the Placement Rate is % RJS Reading Scores less than 12 (or don't know).
WELFARE STATUS	For all three measures, the reference group on this variable is % No AFDC or State Aid Received (or don't know).
CENTER TYPE	The worksheets for each of the three measures shows % CCC Center and the reference group is % Contract Center. Another factor relating to center type is % All Male Center and the reference group is % Co-ed Center.
CENTER LOCATION	The reference group for this factor on the two retention rates is % Rural or Inner-City Location.
PHYSICAL SETTING	For the retention rates, two factors shown are % Campus Setting and % Self-Contained Center (i.e. all buildings and activities at one center site and not at other locations). The reference groups are the converse of these being % Not Campus Style Setting and % Not Self-Contained center.
HOMETOWN	On the Placement Rate, the reference group for this variable is % From Place Less Than 10,000.
CENTER RESIDENTS	For all three measures, the reference group on this variable is % Corpsmembers Living Off Center (i.e. commuters).

Sources of Corpsmember Home State Socio-Economic Data

Factor	Definition and Time Period	Source
AVERAGE ANNUAL PAY 1981 ($1,000s)	State average annual pay of workers covered by State and Federal Unemployment Insurance Programs (CY 1981)	Employment and Wages (ES-202) Program, Division of Occupational and Administrative Statistic Bureau of Labor Statistics

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sources of Home State Data, cont'd

Factor	Definition and Time Period	Source
% POPULATION IN THE LABOR FORCE 1982	State 12-month average (October 1981-September 1982)	Division of Local Area Unemployment Statistics, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics
% UNEMPLOYMENT 1982	State 12-month average for persons in the labor force (October 1981-September 1982)	Same as above
% EMPLOYED IN SERVICE OR MANUFACTURING 1982	State annual average (CY 1982)	Manufacturing, Services and Total Non-agricultural Employment CY 1982, Current Employment Statistics (BLS-790 Series), Division of Monthly Industry Employment Statistics, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics
POPULATION 1982 (1,000,000s)	Preliminary estimates of State populations, July 1, 1982	Population Division, Bureau of the Census, Population Estimates and Projections, Series P-25, No. 927, issued February 1983.
PUBLIC EDUCATION EXPENDITURES PER ADA PUPIL 1981 ($1,000s)	State average per pupil expenditures based on average daily attendance (ADA) for school year ending June 1981	Bureau of the Census Statistical Abstract of the U.S. (1982-83), p. 155, 103rd edition and U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics, Digest of Education Statistics

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS	MODEL WORKSHEET	
A. NAME OF JOB CORPS CENTER (FY 82 Los Angeles data)	B. NAME OF CONTRACTOR/AGENCY Example	
C. CONTRACT NUMBER	D. CONTRACT PERIOD From:	To:
E. TYPE OF CALCULATION ("X" One) ☐ RFP ☐ Performance Review for Time Period: FY 82		Date of Calculation (Mo., Day, Yr.)

F. PERFORMANCE MEASURE

180 Day Retention Rate ("STAY180")

G. LOCAL FACTOR SUMMARY (See reverse side for detail)		COMBINED WEIGHTS
• CORPSMEMBER CHARACTERISTICS	(Sub-total for items 1 - 23)	6.32
• CENTER CONFIGURATION	(Sub-total for items 24 - 31)	4.76
• HOME STATE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS	(Sub-total for items 32 - 36)	1.48
	TOTAL ➤	13.06

H. NATIONAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE LEVEL (Preprinted for convenience)		53.53
I. PREDICTED CENTER PERFORMANCE LEVEL		66.59
J. PREDICTED PERFORMANCE RANGE ADJUSTMENT	Negative ➤	-4.5
	Positive ➤	+3.9
K. INITIAL PLANNED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	Minimum ➤	62.09
	Maximum ➤	70.49
L. RECALCULATED PERFORMANCE STANDARD	Minimum ➤	
3/84	Maximum ➤	

ETA [illegible] (Dec. 1983)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS - Continued 1/84 STAY180 EXAMPLE

LOCAL FACTORS (Number each consecutively)	Actual for Previous Period (a)	Current Period Planned Values (b)	National Average Factor Values* (c)	Difference (b) − (c) + (d)	−	"Weights" (e)	Effects of Local Factors + (f)	−
• Corpsmember Characteristics								
1. % Age 17 at entry		11.7	20.5		-8.8	.025		-.22
2. % Age 18 at entry		22.9	20.3	2.6		.042	.11	
3. % Age 19 at entry		20.2	18.2	2.0		.067	.13	
4. % Age 20 at entry		20.8	13.2	7.6		.079	.60	
5. % Age 21 at entry		17.6	9.9	7.7		.058	.44	
6. % White		11.8	29.4		-17.6	-.138	2.43	
7. % Hispanic		29.6	9.0	20.6		-.034		-.70
8. % American Indian		1.0	3.6		-2.6	-.109	.28	
9. % Asian-Pacific		10.0	3.1	6.9		.183	1.26	
10. % Needs bilingual instruction		7.1	3.4	3.7		.197	.73	
11. % 9 yrs schooling		9.7	23.3		-13.6	.022		-.30
12. % 10 yrs schooling		17.4	23.6		-6.2	.036		-.22
13. % 11 yrs schooling		25.2	16.1	9.1		.047	.43	
14. % 12 yrs schooling		35.6	18.7	16.9		.118	1.99	
15. % Family size of 4 or more		58.7	67.1		-8.4	-.004	.03	
16. % Receiving AFDC or State Aid		41.4	38.4	2.7		-.012		-.03
17. % RJS score 7-11		15.0	19.4		-4.4	.056		-.24
18. % RJS score 12-15		16.2	21.0		-4.8	.082		-.39
19. % RJS score 16-20		27.2	27.5		-.3	.108		-.03
20. % RJS score 21-25		23.8	18.3	5.5		.134	.74	
21. % Female		58.8	37.3	21.5		-.012		-.26
22. % One or more dependents		14.4	8.0	6.4		-.028		-.18
23. % Family head		12.3	7.2	5.1		-.020		-.10
						**Sub-Total=	6.32	
• Center Configuration								
24. * Center residents		52.0	91.5		-39.5	-.176	6.95	
25. % Self-contained ctr @		0	75.0		-75.0	.039		-2.92
26. % Campus style setting @		0	73.8		-73.8	.029		-2.14
27. % Location not rural or inner-city @		0	49.4		-49.4	-.010	.49	
28. % CCC center @		100	26.7	73.3		.055	4.03	
29. % All male center @		0	11.6		-11.6	.012		-.14
30. Avg facility rating		4.44	6.05		-1.61	.982		-1.58
31. Capacity (1,000s)		.74	.69	.05		1.605	.08	
						**Sub-Total=	4.76	
(@ Each center scores either 0 or 100 on these items)								
• Home State Socio-economic Aspects								
32. % Employed in service or manufactng 1982		42.8	40.5	2.3		-.278		-.64
33. % Unemployed 1982		9.7	8.86	.84		.363	.16	
34. Average annual pay 1981 ($1,000s)		16.7	15.27	1.43		-.858		-1.23
35. Population 1982 (1,000,000s)		24.7	8.16	16.54		.181	2.99	
36. Public education expenditures per ADA pupil 1981 ($1,000s)		2.59	2.27	.32		2.[illegible]	.74	
						**Sub-Total=	1.98	
						TOTAL	13.06	

NOTES: *Data for columns (c) and (e) are supplied for convenience.
**Enter sub-totals for each category and overall total on other side.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR
JOB CORPS CENTERS

MODEL WORKSHEET

A. NAME OF JOB CORPS CENTER

B. NAME OF CONTRACTOR/AGENCY

C. CONTRACT NUMBER

D. CONTRACT PERIOD
From:
To:

Date of Calculation (Mo., Day, Yr.)

E. TYPE OF CALCULATION ("X" One)
☐ RFP
☐ Performance Review for Time Period: ______________________

F. PERFORMANCE MEASURE
90 Day Retention Rate ("STAY90")

		COMBINED WEIGHTS
G. LOCAL FACTOR SUMMARY (See reverse side for detail)		
• CORPSMEMBER CHARACTERISTICS	Sub-total for items 1 - 23)	________
• CENTER CONFIGURATION	Sub-total for items 24 - 31)	________
• HOME STATE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS	Sub-total for items 32 - 36)	________
	TOTAL ➤	________

H. NATIONAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE LEVEL (Preprinted for convenience)		69.68
I. PREDICTED CENTER PERFORMANCE LEVEL		________
J. PREDICTED PERFORMANCE RANGE ADJUSTMENT	Negative ➤	-3.9
	Positive ➤	4.5
K. INITIAL PLANNED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	Minimum ➤	________
	Maximum ➤	________
L. RECALCULATED PERFORMANCE STANDARD	Minimum ➤	________
	Maximum ➤	________

1/84

ETA 6608 (Oct 1983)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS - Continued 1/84

STAY90

LOCAL FACTORS (Number each accessory)	Actual for Previous Period (a)	Current Period Planned Value: (b)	National Average Factor Values* (c)	Difference (b) − (c) (d) + −	Weights* (e)	Effects of Local Factors (f) + −
• Corpsmember Characteristics						
1. % Age 17 at entry			20.5		-.001	
2. % Age 18 at entry			20.3		.004	
3. % Age 19 at entry			18.2		.016	
4. % Age 20 at entry			13.2		.028	
5. % Age 21 at entry			9.9		.007	
6. % White			29.4		-.138	
7. % Hispanic			9.0		-.038	
8. % American Indian			3.6		-.082	
9. % Asian-Pacific			3.1		.114	
10. % Needs bilingual instruction			3.4		.160	
11. % 9 yrs schooling			23.3		.020	
12. % 10 yrs schooling			23.6		.036	
13. % 11 yrs schooling			16.1		.049	
14. % 12 yrs schooling			18.7		.084	
15. % Family size of 4 or more			67.1		-.013	
16. % Received AFDC or State Aid			38.4		-.015	
17. % RJS score 7-11			19.4		.083	
18. % RJS score 12-15			21.0		.113	
19. % RJS score 16-20			27.5		.143	
20. % RJS score 21-25			18.3		.173	
21. % Female			37.3		-.011	
22. % One or more dependents			8.0		-.028	
23. % Family head			7.2		-.010	
					**Sub-Total→	
• Center Configuration						
24. % Center residents			91.5		-.175	
25. % Self-contained ctr @			75.0		.041	
26. % Campus style setting @			73.8		.020	
27. % Location not rural or inner-city @			49.4		-.020	
28. % CCC center @			26.7		.054	
29. % All male center @			11.6		-.026	
30. Avg facility rating			6.05		1.014	
31. Capacity (1,000s)			.69		2.211	
(@ Each center scores either 0 or 100 on these items)					**Sub-Total→	
• Home Base Socio-economic Aspects						
32. % Employed in service or manufactng 1982			40.5		-.325	
33. % Unemployed 1982			8.86		.178	
34. Average annual pay 1981 ($1,000s)			15.27		-.999	
35. Population 1982 (1,000,000s)			8.16		.213	
36. Public education expenditures per ADA pupil 1981 ($1,000s)			2.27		2.315	
					**Sub-Total→	
					TOTAL ➤	

NOTES: *Data for columns (c) and (e) preprinted for convenience.
**Enter sub-totals for each category and overall total in other side.

Page 9

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS	**MODEL WORKSHEET**
A. NAME OF JOB CORPS CENTER	B. NAME OF CONTRACTOR/AGENCY
C. CONTRACT NUMBER	D. CONTRACT PERIOD From: To:
E. TYPE OF CALCULATION ("X" One) ☐ BPP ☐ Performance Review for Time Period: ____________	Date of Calculation (Mo., Day, Yr.)

F. PERFORMANCE MEASURE

180 Day Retention Rate ("STAY180")

G. LOCAL FACTOR SUMMARY (See reverse side for detail)		COMBINED WEIGHTS
• CORPSMEMBER CHARACTERISTICS	(Sub-total for items 1 - 23)	____________
• CENTER CONFIGURATION	(Sub-total for items 24 - 31)	____________
• HOME STATE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS	(Sub-total for items 32 - 36)	____________
	TOTAL ➤	____________

H. NATIONAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE LEVEL (Preprinted for convenience)		53.53
I. PREDICTED CENTER PERFORMANCE LEVEL		____________
J. PREDICTED PERFORMANCE RANGE ADJUSTMENT	Negative ➤	-4.5
	Positive ➤	+3.9
K. INITIAL PLANNED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	Minimum ➤	____________
	Maximum ➤	____________
L. RECALCULATED PERFORMANCE STANDARD	Minimum ➤	____________
1/84	Maximum ➤	____________

ETA 6690 (Dec 1983)

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS – Continued 1/84 STAY180

LOCAL FACTORS (Number each consecutively)	Actual for Previous Period	Current Period Planned Value:	National Average Factor Values*	Difference (b) – (c)	Weights*	Effects of Local Factors
	(a)	(b)	(c)	+ (d) –	(e)	+ (f) –
• Corpsmember Characteristics						
1. % Age 17 at entry			20.5		.025	
2. % Age 18 at entry			20.3		.042	
3. % Age 19 at entry			18.2		.067	
4. % Age 20 at entry			13.2		.079	
5. % Age 21 at entry			9.9		.058	
6. % White			29.4		-.138	
7. % Hispanic			9.0		-.03[illegible]	
8. % American Indian			3.6		-.109	
9. % Asian-Pacific			3.1		.183	
10. % Needs bilingual instruction			3.4		.197	
11. % 9 yrs schooling			23.3		.022	
12. % 10 yrs schooling			23.6		.036	
13. % 11 yrs schooling			16.1		.047	
14. % 12 yrs schooling			18.7		.118	
15. % Family size of 4 or more			67.1		-.004	
16. % Received AFDC or State Aid			38.4		-.012	
17. % RJS score 7-11			19.4		.056	
18. % RJS score 12-15			21.0		.082	
19. % RJS score 16-20			27.5		.108	
20. % RJS score 21-25			18.3		.134	
21. % Female			37.3		-.012	
22. % One or more dependents			8.0		-.028	
23. % Family head			7.2		-.020	
					**Sub-Total→	
• Center Configuration						
24. % Center residents			91.5		-.176	
25. % Self-contained ctr @			75.0		.039	
26. % Campus style setting @			73.8		.029	
27. % Location not rural or inner-city @			49.4		-.010	
28. % CCC center @			26.7		.055	
29. % All male center @			11.6		.012	
30. Avg facility rating			6.05		.982	
31. Capacity (1,000s)			.69		1.605	
(@ Each center scores either 0 or 100 on these items)					**Sub-Total→	
• Home State Socio-economic Aspects						
32. % Employed in service or manufactrg 1982			40.5		-.278	
33. % Unemployed 1982			8.86		.363	
34. Average annual pay 1981 ($1,000s)			15.27		-.858	
35. Population 1982 (1,000,000s)			8.16		.181	
36. Public education expenditures per ADA pupil 1981 ($1,000s)			2.27		2.201	
					**Sub-Total→	
					TOTAL ➤	

NOTES: *Data for columns (c) and (e) preprinted for convenience.
**Find sub-totals for each category and overall total in other side.

5

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
FOR
JOB CORPS CENTERS

MODEL WORKSHEET

A. NAME OF JOB CORPS CENTER

B. NAME OF CONTRACTOR/AGENCY

C. CONTRACT NUMBER

D. CONTRACT PERIOD
From: To:

E. TYPE OF CALCULATION ("X" One)
☐ RFP
☐ Performance Review for Time Period: ____________

Date of Calculation (Mo., Day, Yr.)

F. PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Placement Rate for 180 Day Stayers

G. LOCAL FACTOR SUMMARY (See reverse side for detail)	COMBINED WEIGHTS
• CORPSMEMBER CHARACTERISTICS . . . . (Sub-total for items 1 - 13)	
• CENTER CONFIGURATION . . . . (Sub-total for items 14 - 16)	
• HOME STATE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ASPECTS . . . . . . (Sub-total for items 17 - 22)	
TOTAL ➤	

H. NATIONAL AVERAGE PERFORMANCE LEVEL (Preprinted for convenience)		73.78
I. PREDICTED CENTER PERFORMANCE LEVEL		
J. PREDICTED PERFORMANCE RANGE ADJUSTMENT	Negative ➤	-5.2
	Positive ➤	+7.6
K. INITIAL PLANNED PERFORMANCE LEVEL	Minimum ➤	
	Maximum ➤	
L. RECALCULATED PERFORMANCE STANDARD	Minimum ➤	
1/84	Maximum ➤	

ETA [illegible] (Oct. [illegible])

Placement Rate

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR JOB CORPS CENTERS – Continued

1/84 LOCAL FACTORS (Number each consecutively)	Actual for Previous Period (a)	Current Period Planned Value: (b)	National Average Factor Values* (c)	Difference (b) − (c) + (d) −	Weights* (e)	Effects of Local Factors + (f) −
• Corpsmember Characteristics						
1. % Age 15-16 at entry			15.9		.019	
2. % Female			34.4		-.054	
3. % Black			54.8		-.126	
4. % Hispanic			9.5		-.022	
5. % American Indian			2.6		-.103	
6. % Asian/Pacific			3.1		.041	
7. % 12 yrs or more of schooling			21.0		.043	
8. % Corpsmembers that are dependents			68.5		-.026	
9. % Received AFDC			22.6		-.037	
10. % RJS score 12-25			71.1		.060	
11. % From place 10,000-49,999			17.8		.030	
12. % From place 50,000-249,999			20.6		.021	
13. % From place 250,000 or over			37.2		.093	
					**Sub-Total	
• Center Configuration						
14. % Center residents			90.8		-.263	
15. % All male centers@			13.5		.039	
16. % CCC Centers @			29.8		.032	
(@ Each center scores either 0 or 100 on these items)					**Sub-Total	
• Home Base Socio-economic Aspects						
17. Population 1982 (1,000,000s)			8.94		-.045	
18. % Population in the labor force 1982			47.2		-1.026	
19. % Unemployment 1982			9.07		-1.089	
20. Average annual pay 1981 ($1,000s)			15.33		.442	
21. % Employed in manufacturing 1982			20.17		-.593	
22. Public education expenditures per ADA pupil 1981 ($1,000s)			2.30		13.088	
					**Sub-Total	
					TOTAL ➤	

NOTES: *Data for columns (c) and (e) preprinted for convenience.
**Enter sub-totals for each category and overall total in other side.

Page 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment #4

90 DAY RETENTION RATES - Center Rankings by Residuals, FY82

	Center Name	Number	Actual Rate	Predicted Rate	Residual
1	JOLIET	167	49.1018	65.3347	-13.762
2	GOLCONDA	359	59.8886	70.3726	-10.709
3	GREAT ONYX	179	59.2179	69.8457	-10.197
4	WOODSTOCK	729	62.1399	71.6768	-9.662
5	KNOXVILLE	657	61.4060	70.9792	-9.619
6	COLLBRAN	308	59.4156	68.6386	-9.441
7	BAMBERG	247	57.8942	67.0912	-9.219
8	SUSQUEHANNA	562	62.2776	72.3109	-9.173
9	CLEVELAND	896	62.3884	71.6024	-8.918
10	IROQUOIS	202	67.8218	75.4272	-8.406
11	FRENCHBURG	204	64.7059	75.9323	-8.169
12	KITTRELL	525	63.0476	70.8729	-7.905
13	SCHENCK	311	61.0932	69.8256	-7.888
14	ROSWELL	364	62.3626	69.4839	-6.867
15	BLACKWELL	286	66.0839	73.6895	-6.783
16	LAREDO	246	62.1951	69.1688	-6.370
17	HAWAII	215	77.2093	81.0008	-5.457
18	CASSADAGA	352	64.2045	66.2430	-5.360
19	BRUNSWICK	506	58.8933	64.8582	-5.255
20	GRAFTON	653	54.8239	59.4725	-4.674
21	DELAWARE VALLEY	466	69.5279	73.3225	-4.557
22	DAYTON	248	63.3065	67.8701	-4.537
23	JACKSONVILLE	308	63.5844	70.5321	-4.206
24	EXCELSIOR SPRINGS	789	59.4423	63.6466	-4.075
25	CHESAPEAKE	773	67.2704	72.0323	-3.894
26	PINE KNOT	350	67.1429	71.2990	-3.872
27	TREASURE LAKE	377	67.6394	71.1648	-3.678
28	GARY	3055	67.7250	71.2440	-3.688
29	SACRAMENTO	477	80.7128	83.7957	-3.566
30	POTOMAC	605	68.5950	72.8396	-3.064
31	FLATWOODS	307	64.4951	67.9221	-2.837
32	INLAND EMPIRE	309	77.9935	80.6658	-2.705
33	HARPERS FERRY	271	66.4207	73.3250	-2.458
34	BATESVILLE	396	64.6465	68.8823	-2.431
35	ONEONTA	588	65.9841	68.5791	-2.405
36	L B JOHNSON	307	71.0098	73.5145	-2.388
37	SIERRA NEVADA	845	66.2722	68.9007	-2.320
38	WESTOVER	906	66.0044	67.8262	-1.956
39	GRAND RAPIDS	723	61.8257	63.3737	-1.870
40	LOS ANGELES	734	81.3351	83.4427	-1.638
41	OCONALUFTEE	249	66.6667	68.2914	-1.356
42	GULFPORT	341	67.1554	68.5559	-1.289
43	DENISON	410	63.4146	66.6258	-1.171
44	TUSKEGEE	304	66.1184	68.9769	-1.066
45	ATTERBURY	736	69.4293	70.9558	-0.984
46	TURNER	1401	69.0221	70.4982	-0.965
47	GUTHRIE	943	68.0851	68.9096	-0.865
48	WHITNEY YOUNG	458	66.8122	67.5626	-0.671
49	ST LOUIS	847	71.9008	72.4257	-0.271

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

40-051 O—84——8

90 Day Retention Rates, Con[illegible]
Center Rankings by Residual: [illegible]Y82

Attachment #4 - Page 2

	Center Name	Number	Actual Rate	Predicted Rate	Residual
50	OLD DOMINION	475	67.7895	67.5725	-0.186
51	CINCINNATI	288	70.4861	71.0843	-0.013
52	WOODLAND	369	63.9566	65.3244	0.049
53	ALBUQUERQUE	600	70.1667	70.0545	0.253
54	KICKING HORSE	333	76.8769	76.1429	0.524
55	ATLANTA	687	69.5779	69.4243	0.576
56	OUACHITA	273	67.3993	66.9830	0.595
57	PITTSBURGH	460	65.4348	64.1665	0.6611
58	CHARLESTON	473	65.3277	64.8163	0.7820
59	KEYSTONE	750	67.4667	66.1599	1.0742
60	FORT SIMCOE	303	67.9868	66.1381	1.2230
61	MINGO	321	70.4050	68.9328	1.4722
62	MCKINNEY	864	68.8657	67.0795	1.5293
63	PRESTONSBURG	317	54.8896	51.4656	1.8445
64	TRAPPER CREEK	253	79.8419	77.0098	1.9602
65	TONGUE POINT	629	75.0397	72.9855	2.1768
66	SAN DIEGO	615	77.8862	78.0906	2.2176
67	JACOBS CREEK	281	67.6157	65.6780	2.4379
68	BOXELDER	273	73.9927	70.9831	2.6603
69	PINE RIDGE	348	62.0690	61.3109	2.7142
70	CLEARFIELD	1668	74.9400	72.3191	2.9780
71	BLUE RIDGE	271	63.0996	59.7852	3.4961
72	E CLEMENTS	2946	76.4087	72.7318	3.5595
73	DETROIT	411	76.1557	71.9592	4.2570
74	GLENMONT	511	73.1898	69.9170	4.3569
75	PHOENIX	460	81.3043	76.8824	4.4609
76	H HUMPHREY	408	67.8922	63.3050	5.0327
77	NEW JERSEY	417	71.7026	63.6171	5.4636
78	RED ROCK	418	63.3971	58.9498	5.5003
79	TAHLEQUAH	349	60.7450	57.5484	6.0850
80	GAINESVILLE	420	75.4762	69.0973	6.8928
81	ANGELL	266	74.0602	67.4359	6.9827
82	LITTLE ROCK	270	65.9259	58.3993	8.0038
83	CASS	251	75.6972	70.7388	8.0491
84	WOLF CREEK	294	73.1293	66.9476	8.1481
85	PENOBSCOT	645	70.8527	62.6074	8.2498
86	COLUMBIA BASIN	278	73.7410	65.0934	8.7247
87	WEBER BASIN	229	78.1659	69.1290	9.4099
88	TUCSON	297	84.5118	75.9785	10.0593
89	SAN JOSE	514	79.9611	74.8299	10.7397
90	CURLEW	223	74.8879	63.7207	11.5174
91	ANACONDA	299	84.6154	73.7875	11.5784
92	CRYSTAL SPRINGS	343	77.8426	66.1469	11.6992
93	SHREVEPORT	404	76.2376	70.2971	14.5130
94	NORTHLANDS	398	72.8643	61.0305	14.7590
95	SOUTH BRONX	234	79.4872	64.2055	15.8850
96	TIMBER LAKE	241	82.9876	67.1600	16.5310
97	MARSING	239	79.4979	61.1917	18.5440
98	EL PASO	440	94.7727	74.9413	19.7703

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

180 DAY RETENTION RATES - Center Rankings by Residuals, FY82

	Center Name	Number	Actual Rate	Predicted Rate	Residual
1	JOLIET	167	32.3353	50.3293	-16.367
2	GOLCONDA	360	47.2222	58.6599	-11.733
3	SUSQUEHANNA	562	43.0605	55.0721	-11.405
4	KITTRELL	525	43.8095	54.7279	-10.966
5	FRENCHBURG	205	48.2927	59.3701	-10.351
6	GREAT ONYX	179	46.3687	57.1008	-10.317
7	COLLBRAN	308	44.1558	54.1899	-10.043
8	JACKSONVILLE	308	41.8831	52.2076	-9.691
9	CLEVELAND	896	46.2054	55.4490	-8.919
10	HAWAII	215	62.7907	69.1310	-8.805
11	WOODSTOCK	729	46.7764	55.7208	-8.527
12	SCHENCK	311	47.5884	56.6277	-8.165
13	BAMBERG	247	43.7247	50.8662	-7.036
14	EXCELSIOR SPRINGS	790	40.6329	47.7928	-7.017
15	CHESAPEAKE	773	47.7361	54.6903	-6.928
16	BLACKWELL	286	53.8462	61.4638	-6.787
17	KNOXVILLE	696	48.7069	54.8094	-6.357
18	TUSKEGEE	304	46.7105	53.6370	-6.269
19	SACRAMENTO	476	63.2353	68.6556	-5.522
20	PINE KNOT	350	52.2857	58.6439	-5.452
21	PRESTONSBURG	317	32.4921	37.3557	-5.300
22	LAREDO	246	47.9675	53.1412	-5.040
23	ROSWELL	364	46.7033	52.5512	-4.888
24	IROQUOIS	204	55.3922	58.2755	-4.591
25	TREASURE LAKE	377	52.5199	54.9822	-4.523
26	PITTSBURGH	461	43.1670	46.4224	-3.991
27	SIERRA NEVADA	847	49.4687	53.4297	-3.930
28	FLATWOODS	307	48.8599	53.9763	-3.807
29	GARY	3055	49.9836	53.4089	-3.800
30	DENISON	410	44.8780	50.4030	-3.650
31	DELAWARE VALLEY	464	54.0948	56.3113	-3.313
32	ALBUQUERQUE	600	49.5000	52.9978	-3.310
33	GRAFTON	652	39.8774	43.1729	-3.183
34	WHITNEY YOUNG	458	48.2533	51.1097	-3.132
35	GRAND RAPIDS	723	46.7497	49.6923	-1.955
36	ATTERBURY	736	55.0272	57.0978	-1.791
37	ONEONTA	588	49.6599	51.5875	-1.680
38	TONGUE POINT	629	55.9618	57.7240	-1.565
39	H HUMPHREY	408	45.0980	47.1977	-1.551
40	DAYTON	248	50.8065	52.7658	-1.516
41	CASSADAGA	352	51.4205	48.8148	-1.496
42	GUTHRIE	941	51.0096	52.1580	-1.265
43	INLAND EMPIRE	309	65.6958	66.6191	-1.155
44	WESTOVER	906	51.7660	52.9173	-1.040
45	HARPERS FERRY	271	56.4576	60.4970	-0.941
46	QUACHITA	273	53.4799	54.2500	-0.734
47	GLENMONT	511	51.8591	52.6343	-0.560
48	SAN DIEGO	615	60.6504	63.0345	-0.192
49	BATESVILLE	396	51.5152	53.3248	-0.099

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

180 DAY RETENTION RATES, Cont'd
Center Rankings by Residuals. FY82

	Center Name	Number	Actual Rate	Predicted Rate	Residual
50	CINCINNATI	289	54.6713	55.1822	-0.022
51	ATLANTA	487	52.8384	52.6594	0.326
52	JACOBS CREEK	281	54.0925	54.3014	0.409
53	OCONALUFTEE	249	55.0201	54.5999	0.642
54	TAHLEQUAH	348	36.4943	38.7575	0.656
55	DETROIT	410	56.5854	55.1541	0.672
56	MINGO	322	52.4845	51.4450	1.039
57	BRUNSWICK	508	48.6220	48.4190	1.1643
58	MCKINNEY	864	51.7361	50.0371	1.3303
59	GULFPORT	341	53.0792	51.9966	1.4569
60	POTOMAC	604	57.4503	57.2621	1.5614
61	FORT SIMCOE	303	55.1155	53.2090	1.6521
62	KEYSTONE	750	52.9333	50.8869	1.7372
63	KICKING HORSE	333	59.4595	56.9822	2.1087
64	LOS ANGELES	732	69.3989	67.6531	2.2283
65	ST LOUIS	844	58.1754	55.9674	2.3559
66	WOODLAND	369	50.1355	49.0304	2.6114
67	GAINESVILLE	420	55.2381	54.0755	2.6176
68	CLEARFIELD	1669	57.6992	55.0085	2.6790
69	E CLEMENTS	2947	58.3305	55.2799	2.7439
70	PHOENIX	460	62.3913	59.0121	3.1769
71	L B JOHNSON	307	60.2606	56.8455	3.3657
72	TURNER	1401	57.5303	54.5541	3.5630
73	TRAPPER CREEK	252	63.4921	58.3846	3.6244
74	OLD DOMINION	475	54.1053	49.7463	3.8174
75	BLUE RIDGE	272	47.7941	43.5481	3.9227
76	CHARLESTON	472	52.7542	47.8093	5.2956
77	NEW JERSEY	417	60.1918	51.1945	5.6300
78	RED ROCK	418	46.6507	41.2515	5.8073
79	BOXELDER	273	57.8755	51.5401	5.8443
80	TUCSON	297	67.0034	60.4697	7.0774
81	PINE RIDGE	348	51.7241	49.4333	7.9143
82	LITTLE ROCK	270	48.8889	41.4024	8.0047
83	WOLF CREEK	294	60.2041	54.0465	8.0324
84	PENOBSCOT	645	54.7287	46.6266	8.1102
85	NORTHLANDS	399	50.3759	43.1678	9.3257
86	SAN JOSE	514	62.6459	59.6298	10.4968
87	ANGELL	267	61.4232	50.6282	10.7618
88	COLUMBIA BASIN	278	58.6331	48.3056	10.9672
89	WEBER BASIN	229	62.4454	51.5129	11.0442
90	SOUTH BRONX	234	58.5470	48.2319	11.4966
91	CURLEW	223	63.6771	51.1938	12.1375
92	CRYSTAL SPRINGS	343	62.9738	50.3606	12.7163
93	ANACONDA	299	66.8896	54.6959	12.8999
94	CASS	251	68.5259	58.5850	13.2765
95	SHREVEPORT	404	60.6436	53.1428	18.1653
96	TIMBER LAKE	241	72.1992	54.0016	18.9598
97	MARSING	239	67.4640	47.4581	20.3833
98	EL PASO	441	81.6327	58.8198	23.4344

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attachment #4 - Page 5

PLACEMENT RATE FOR 180 DAY STAYERS - Center Rankings by Residuals

	Center Name	Number	Actual Rate	Predicted Rate	Residual
1	FRENCHBURG	39	33.3333	64.8635	-27.826
2	GRAND RAPIDS	156	37.1795	62.8784	-27.352
3	ATLANTA	141	39.0071	64.7392	-25.890
4	KITTRELL	97	34.0206	58.9653	-25.270
5	ATTERBURY	111	42.3423	63.2056	-21.387
6	ANACONDA	52	71.1538	91.5511	-20.963
7	JACOBS CREEK	55	47.2727	65.7670	-18.494
8	CRYSTAL SPRINGS	38	36.8421	55.3955	-18.253
9	GAINESVILLE	50	50.0000	66.2605	-17.281
10	CLEVELAND	111	54.0541	71.3691	-16.323
11	ONEONTA	100	73.0000	87.6012	-15.558
12	HAWAII	47	80.8511	92.9770	-14.926
13	TRAPPER CREEK	28	75.0000	90.9886	-14.066
14	PRESTONSBURG	43	60.4651	66.7338	-13.793
15	H HUMPHREY	68	63.2353	75.6134	-13.709
16	ROSWELL	47	72.3404	83.2841	-11.856
17	BRUNSWICK	73	45.2055	56.0325	-10.962
18	BLACKWELL	58	65.5172	75.1951	-10.909
19	SCHENCK	66	51.5152	62.4446	-10.767
20	JACKSONVILLE	46	71.7391	80.8225	-9.083
21	OCUNALUFTEE	81	56.7901	65.8687	-9.079
22	PITTSBURGH	51	74.5098	79.7412	-6.111
23	SOUTH BRONX	43	83.7209	91.8285	-6.114
24	GLENMONT	110	85.4545	91.2473	-5.926
25	TURNER	256	51.5625	57.7693	-5.159
26	IROQUOIS	26	80.7692	88.4446	-5.111
27	JULIET	9	55.5556	59.8401	-4.285
28	CASS	34	70.5882	74.3287	-3.740
29	GRAFTON	51	70.5882	74.2768	-3.689
30	LOS ANGELES	165	88.4848	91.3616	-3.463
31	BAMBERG	24	50.0000	50.4235	-2.597
32	PINE KNOT	79	62.0253	65.5067	-2.349
33	SHREVEPORT	51	74.5098	75.6918	-2.162
34	DAYTON	62	62.9032	64.9440	-2.041
35	DELAWARE VALLEY	90	82.2222	85.1643	-1.635
36	ALBUQUERQUE	69	86.9565	87.9820	-1.217
37	GOLCONDA	52	69.2308	70.1239	-0.893
38	BOXELDER	52	86.5385	86.9883	-0.714
39	SIERRA NEVADA	149	75.1678	76.7126	-0.626
40	WESTOVER	150	76.6667	76.7881	-0.437
41	COLLBRAN	36	91.6667	92.0993	-0.433
42	CLEARFIELD	250	82.4000	82.1228	-0.114
43	E CLEMENTS	764	54.5812	54.8076	-0.053
44	WHITNEY YOUNG	94	58.5106	58.1410	0.101
45	CHARLESTON	68	77.9412	77.3279	0.613
46	KEYSTONE	144	71.5278	69.8504	0.864
47	CASSADAGA	54	79.6296	79.8136	1.318
48	SACRAMENTO	159	88.6792	87.1480	1.443
49	PINE RIDGE	60	88.3333	85.9858	1.769

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Placement Rates for 180 Day Stayers, Cont'd
Center Rankings by Residuals, FY 82

	Center Name	Number	Actual Rate	Predicted Rate	Residual
50	GREAT ONYX	42	64.2857	62.5040	1.782
51	POTOMAC	91	85.7143	83.1625	2.065
52	TUSKEGEE	59	54.2373	51.0734	2.496
53	WEBER BASIN	35	85.7143	85.0610	2.818
54	TAHLEQUAH	34	76.4706	73.5428	2.928
55	KNOXVILLE	105	65.7143	61.5744	3.009
56	TONGUE POINT	148	85.8108	83.2463	3.055
57	INLAND EMPIRE	68	88.2353	84.7414	3.1374
58	MARSING	83	89.1566	85.7293	3.1596
59	WOODLAND	77	76.6234	75.0468	3.2140
60	GARY	336	74.7024	71.0989	3.4465
61	PHOENIX	138	96.3768	92.4444	3.5873
62	EL PASO	96	89.5833	85.5381	3.8736
63	KICKING HORSE	32	81.2500	76.7309	3.9142
64	TIMBER LAKE	77	85.7143	81.4295	4.0968
65	FORT SIMCOE	99	90.9091	85.9588	4.6662
66	ST LOUIS	111	80.1802	74.3026	5.5139
67	SAN DIEGO	192	84.3750	78.5838	5.5432
68	WOLF CREEK	67	88.0597	81.4655	5.6313
69	PENOBSCOT	201	85.5721	80.3157	5.6599
70	TUCSON	77	94.8052	87.8832	6.5613
71	DENISON	58	86.2069	79.1750	6.7899
72	CURLEW	66	89.3939	84.8605	7.2030
73	FLATWOODS	53	84.9057	77.5749	7.3308
74	HARPERS FERRY	57	89.4737	82.8761	7.6001
75	CINCINNATI	61	78.6885	70.8107	7.8778
76	RED ROCK	89	85.3933	77.1183	8.2750
77	OLD DOMINION	81	74.0741	65.7706	8.3034
78	SAN JOSE	177	98.8701	90.1634	8.4944
79	ANGELL	83	87.9518	79.7161	9.0339
80	MINGO	53	83.0189	73.9736	9.0452
81	L B JOHNSON	18	66.6667	57.5329	9.1337
82	BLUE RIDGE	43	81.3953	71.6687	9.2837
83	MCKINNEY	119	79.8319	69.0841	9.4206
84	COLUMBIA BASIN	81	90.1235	80.6755	9.4479
85	CHESAPEAKE	119	78.9916	69.0071	9.5643
86	GULFPORT	46	71.7391	61.1955	9.9156
87	WOODSTOCK	118	86.4407	76.9659	9.9906
88	TREASURE LAKE	63	93.6508	81.6609	11.9899
89	GUTHRIE	109	83.4862	70.0546	12.8025
90	EXCELSIOR SPRINGS	94	93.6170	78.4375	14.8209
91	LAREDO	30	96.6667	80.5788	15.9729
92	NEW JERSEY	85	90.5882	74.4373	16.0389
93	BATESVILLE	48	62.5000	51.4546	16.0454
94	NORTHLANDS	64	85.9375	69.1774	16.5369
95	SUSQUEHANNA	94	88.2979	71.9857	17.0253
96	DETROIT	113	90.2655	73.5549	17.5342
97	OUACHITA	22	95.4545	76.0305	19.2072
98	LITTLE ROCK	5	80.0000	53.3893	26.6107

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ATTACHMENT 5

REVISIONS TO MODEL CENTER RFP

Page I-24, c. Past Performance of the Offeror

The offeror will submit five (5) copies of the following information regarding contract performance:

Provide a list of contracts (including contract numbers) and programs which are currently operated or have been operated in the past three years by the offeror, and detail the offeror's collective experience as it relates to the work required by this RFP. Identify the organizations for whom the work was performed and the inclusive dates. Indicate performance statistics as they relate to past and current contracts. For past or current Job Corps center operators, include a summary of performance for the past three years which compares actual performance to the goals and/or performance standards specified in each contract. For both Job Corps and non-Job Corps contractors, provide information on financial performance against budgets and/or the total contract price and the results of any audits for the past three years.

Page I-31, Information About Offeror's Past Performance

When evaluating an offeror's past performance, review panel members will take into consideration information obtained from governmental units (such as the Office of the Inspector General, ETA components, other Job Corps regional offices, and other agencies). The contracting officer reserves the right to contact non-governmental sources to get information regarding the offeror's past performance and to have this information evaluated by the review panel.

Offerors who have not had a grant or contract with the Department of Labor within three years before the proposed date of award of this contract are subject to a pre-award audit or pre-award survey by the Office of the Inspector General at the request of the Contracting Officor. For offerors who now have a grant or contract with the Department or have had one within the last three years, a performance assessment will be made from a review of documents in the official file. At a minimum, such assessments shall measure performance against contract goals or performance standards, compliance with reporting requriements and financial requirements specified in the contract or grant. Offerors who have, or within the past three years have had, contracts to operate Job Corps centers will also be evaluated for compliance with serious incident reporting as set forth in 684.70, 684.71, 684.133(j) and 684.133(k). Such evaluation will include an assessment of timeliness and accuracy of report submissions, responsiveness of management in handling such incidents, and effectiveness of correct actions in resolving identified administrative or programmatic weaknesses.

Page 22, Clause I.1.c., Performance Goals and Reports

The contractor shall make every effort to achieve the performance standards for the center as calculated in accordance with Job Corps Bulletin 84- . Periodic assessments of actual performance as compared to standards will be conducted, and the results will be an integral part of the procurement process in judging past performance and in the decision process for exercise of option years under this contract.

The contractor shall make its best effort to achieve performance levels within the ranges calculated in accordance with Job Corps Bulletin 84- for the following numerical performance standards:

(1) 90-day retention rate

(2) 180-day retention rate

(3) Placement rate (of terminees who were enrolled for over 180 days)

In addition, the contractor shall be assessed for compliance with the following process standard:

> The prevention, handling and reporting of Type I significant incidents at each center shall be accomplished in accordance with the procedures described in Job Corps Bulletin 84-8 and 20 CFR 684.70, 71, 133(j) and (k).

The contractor shall establish internal goals in accordance with 20 CFR 684.23 and provide an internal monitoring system to ensure compliance with the contract in accordance with 20 CFR 684.134. The contractor shall maintain data on the center's performance in relation to its standards. Data shall be maintained by contract year.

Periodic communications will be held between the Regional Office and the center to evaluate such data and to determine ways to improve performance. It is the contractor's responsibility to notify the regional office of potential problems in meeting the standards and, if appropriate, provide written documentation as to why minimum standards have not been achieved during the contract assessment period.

Page 51, Clause IX c., Exercise of Option

The contracting officer will analyze the option year cost in relation to the current market price in deciding whether to exercise the option. Factors to be considered by the Contracting Officer in the awarding of the option include the contractor's performance compared to performance standards enumerated in Clause I.1.c. and in accordance with Job Corps

Bulletin 84- , compliance with all other terms and conditions of the contract, fair market value of similar service contracts, the necessity of reducing disruptions to operations, and the advantage to the Government.

Failure to achieve minimum performance levels for the numerical standards set for in Clause I.1.c. and calculated in accordance with Job Corps Bulletin 84- will result in an initial unfavorable determination in the Contracting Officer's consideration for exercise of an option year. Meeting or exceeding the maximum levels calculated in accordance with Job Corps Bulletin 84- will result in an initial favorable option year determination.

While the achievement of performance standards will be a major factor in the Contracting Officer's decision regarding the exercise of option years, other information available from center reviews, audit reports, investigations, and other sources regarding compliance with provisions of this contract will also be considered.

If consideration and analysis of the above factors indicates a new contract is most advantageous to the Government, the option will not be exercised. If the analysis of the above factors results in a favorable determination that is advantageous to the Government, the option may be exercised.

Attachment L

NOTE: ATTACHMENT L will be the completed worksheets for each of the numerical standards for the center being competed. They will contain the initial calculation of minimum and maximum ranges of acceptable performance to assist offerors in responding to the RFP.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Senator Quayle, on this particular point, asked this question: In the Federal Register on February 1, 1984, the Department of Labor published the final notice of performance standards for program year 1984 to be applied to title II(A) of the Job Training Partnership Act. These standards include such things as entered employment rate, the cost per person placed in a job, and average wage at placement.

When these same evaluation criteria are applied to the Job Corps, how do the results compare to the results for the title IIA program?

Mr. **O'KEEFE**. Frankly, I do not know. I think we will have to go back and develop an answer.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Will you submit that for us, if you have any answers.

Mr. **JONES**. We have never collected the data on a historical basis to run that kind of comparison. We will take a look at it. I am not sure what would be involved in doing it. If we will do it, we will construct it and supply it.

The **CHAIRMAN**. We do not have much experience to base it on, either, as of right now.

Mr. **JONES**. No; that is part of the problem here.

The **CHAIRMAN**. It might be a good thing, though, to do.

Mr. **JONES**. Also, the definitions, Mr. Chairman, are going to be slightly different in terms of those categories.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Sure.

Mr. **JONES**. We will take a stab at it.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Would you do what you can to give us some correlation between the two? I think that would be helpful.

I have seen photographs, all taken within the past year, of nine different Job Corps Centers, and I have had staff members go to the various centers around the country. These pictures do reveal an alarming discrepancy among the various centers. Some appear as comfortable as a college dormitory while others seem to violate a myriad of health and safety standards which I am concerned about. That defeats the purpose of a residential program to provide a positive atmosphere.

To what can you attribute these differences, and what do you propose to do about them? Some of them really are stark. We have only checked—we only have pictures from nine of the various centers, but that is still a cross section.

Mr. **O'KEEFE**. Senator, when you have 107 different facilities around the country, you can anticipate that there will be a variance in their upkeep and their status.

As Senator Randolph alluded earlier, some of these centers are 20 or 25 years old. Therefore, they are probably reaching the point where the plant and equipment of that center need to be reexamined. One of the things that we are undertaking, and Mr. Rell, since he took over as Director of the Job Corps, is instituting, is an assessment of the facilities' needs across the country in these 107 centers. That is, in my view, the No. 1 priority of the coming months in terms of our administration of the program.

The **CHAIRMAN**. I don't think they all have to look like college dormitories, but some of them are clearly below standards.

Mr. **Jones**. I think, Senator, we should add to that, also, that the one thing we have done each year is to ensure in the Job Corps budget, including 1985, that there are funds there to deal with those kinds of basic health and safety reconstruction at centers. We are doing a continual survey of those, and we would hope that the kinds of things you have seen have either been corrected or are in the pipeline and correction is in the process.

The **Chairman**. I can assure you a number of them have not been corrected. We hope they are in the pipeline.

That is one of the concerns I have: As you look at Job Corps, it is one of the few programs—well, it is the only program I know of that really helps hard-core, unemployed youth. There are others that help, but I am talking about one that really targets this particular group. Yet, we have failed to increase the budget for Job Corps now for the past 3 years.

Look, if the program works as well as I have seen it work, if it really helps these kids who otherwise would have no hope for the future whatsoever—and I see the billions we throw down the drain in other programs that do not do one one-hundredth as much as Job Corps—I think maybe we need to have more emphasis on helping Job Corps to proceed and to grow and to accomplish even more of the great things that they are doing.

Therefore, I am concerned when I see these architectural deficiencies and living deficiencies. I am not saying they have to be college dormitories, but I am saying that there ought to be minimum standards that these centers ought to have to meet.

If it is funding, then we ought to be willing to advocate to get adequate funding so that they can meet those.

Mr. **O'Keefe**. I think you make a very good point here. One of the things that we collectively have to do is we have to look at the Job Corps as an ongoing program with substantial needs both for operations and capital. Over the coming months, I hope that you and your staff and our staff will be able to examine this issue and determine how it is within scarce resources that we can achieve those objectives.

The **Chairman**. I appreciate that, but keep in mind that we are dealing with kids that really are down. They are down. They are kids without a positive attitude for the most part. They come to a place that has a lousy set of accommodations for them, and their attitudes are not going to change very much.

One of the things that I have really appreciated from some of the Job Corps Centers that I visited is that they have really made an effort to make these places vibrant and attractive, and to help these kids away from home to be able to enjoy the totality of the experience—not just learning, not just vocational experience, but also being able to live.

That is something I hope we can all work on.

It is my understanding that the architectural and engineering contracting is being handled currently by a separate arm of ETA. Am I right on that?

Mr. **Jones**. That is correct.

The **Chairman**. How, then, do the Job Corps contractors notify ETA about their structural problems in their centers? What is the process for getting the needed repairs done? Is it the same process as you use for emergencies?

Mr. JONES. Let us describe for you, Senator, the process for the whole facility survey and how those things get done.

Mr. RELL. Senator, we have a regular program of facility surveys where architectural and engineering experts—I am not one—make visits to centers on a biannual basis, to identify any deficiencies that might exist. I would be happy to submit for the record what that looks like.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we will place that in the record.

[NOTE: In the interest of economy, the report referred to entitled "Job Corps Centers Facility Survey Reports, February 1981," was retained in the files of the committee, where it may be researched upon request.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mention to those people that I am going to be checking on them, and they may have to be up here to testify next.

I am concerned about the average length of time between the time when a problem is reported and the contract to repair has been signed.

Mr. RELL. In that regard, Senator, once a facilities survey team goes out to a center and comes up with its findings, there is a preliminary report. The center contractor and our regional office staff have an opportunity to review that and to make their input. With regard to programmatic type improvements, the center operator has an opportunity to suggest those as well before the facility survey report is finalized. Based on those facility survey reports, which are then aggregated at the national level, we prioritize the projects that are to be funded within the available budget that we have for that particular year.

Now how long does it take to actually fix them? Senator, that varies substantially. I think it takes approximately 3 to 6 months to contract for the architectural and engineering services that are necessary for a major renovation. That period of time is the direct product of the Federal regulations governing the procurement process for architectural and engineering services.

The CHAIRMAN. Wouldn't it be better to give the money to the local Job Corps Center and let them refurbish it themselves in accordance with certain standards? Wouldn't you save money? Wouldn't you give them more opportunity? Or do you run into all kinds of labor management problems?

Mr. JONES. You would run into two problems, Senator. One is they would be subject to the same Federal procurement processes for architectural and engineering kinds of contracting, reconstruction contracting, as we would.

Second, you run into a series of local problems.

Third, the most difficult problem in this business, as you know, is that we are dealing with a fixed budget. Across 107 centers we have to very carefully examine the priorities for which things you fix where they fall within that process.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think this is an efficient system the way it is working now or would it be better to have the surveys taken and then say, "Here's the money. You can repair it."?

Mr. Jones. I suspect that is, at best, six of one and half a dozen of the other.

In the real question that you are asking, I do not know that it would change the time frames that much, given the fact that many of the specific steps they would have to go through are the same as we would have to go through.

The Chairman. Sure.

S. 2111 cites certain standards, minimum standards, for plant and facilities. Do you think such uniformity is practical or desirable?

Mr. O'Keefe. Across the country we have 107 different centers. I think that we will, over the next 12 months, seek to establish a set of standards. We think the basic concept——

The Chairman. So it is desirable to do?

Mr. O'Keefe. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Therefore, the bill itself is meaningful?

Mr. O'Keefe. The principle of establishing those standards is one that we are very——

The Chairman. Do you know why I want it in legislation? The reason I want it in legislation is so that you people, who have the very difficult time running this organization, realize the standards you have to meet. Congress will have to take a closer look at your budget situation.

However, we ought to set minimum standards, and we ought to meet those standards. We ought to try to make this not only a learning, but a pleasant, uplifting experience for these young people, which I think the good Job Corps Centers do. In the end, we would all be farther ahead.

Mr. Jones. I think the issue of standards, Senator, is one that we are all going to agree with.

The difficulty because of the diversity of 107 centers that have come online over the course of 20 years, many of which are contributed buildings of various sorts, is that the variance is very high.

The Chairman. We may not have the same type of buildings. We may not have the same type rooms or restroom facilities, or whatever, but they have to at least meet a wide parameter of minimum standards. The main standards is just having them be livable. They have to be good for these kids to go to.

It has been stated, with regard to the administrative problems, that the Employment and Training Administration will carry out a reduction inforce. Now where and how will this reduction inforce take place? What will be the effect on the Job Corps Program?

Mr. O'Keefe. The Employment and Training Administration will be reduced over the next few months. The target date for the actual separation of employees will be about the end of May, middle to the end of May.

With respect to the Job Corps Program, there will be some reductions in force there to take advantage of some of the administrative and management efficiencies that we have built in. I believe, though, we will still have adequate staff responsibilities. When we are done, we will have—Peter, correct me if I am wrong on this—155 people still devoted to the Job Corps.

Mr. **Rell**. 151 in the regional offices and an additional 46 in the national office, Mr. Chairman, for a total of 197 after the RIF is over.

The **Chairman**. Do you consider that adequate, Mr. Rell?

Mr. **Rell**. Senator, a program manager would always like to have more staff. There is no question about that. However, in all fairness, I must say that I think we can do the job.

Mr. **Jones**. Senator, it is only about an 11-person shift from 1983 to 1984 and on up through the line.

Senator **Randolph**. Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt without breaking your stream of questioning?

The **Chairman**. Sure.

Senator **Randolph**. I think we must realize that in this youth bracket there are both young men and young women. Is that correct?

Mr. O'**Keefe**. Yes, Senator.

Senator **Randolph**. Now when we think in terms of a residential program as we have in Charleston, the living conditions there are naturally different than a Job Corps out in the countryside in the County of Jefferson in the Eastern Panhandle. Therefore, to have a sameness, that is not even practical. However, we certainly want cleanliness, of course.

At Charleston we are essentially women. Of course, in the building program, which includes sidewalks and communities in the area, those are young men.

You recognize that; is that correct?

Mr. **Rell**. Yes, sir.

Senator **Randolph**. I think there is a variable there, and we do not want an identical type of, let's say, quarters. I do not think it would even be reasonable to expect it.

The **Chairman**. Thank you, Senator.

Any comments?

Mr. O'**Keefe**. I would just say that there is nothing in our plans that would drive us to a sameness across the centers that we have in this country.

As the chairman was pointing out, we do want to make sure that the minimum standards that are there for health and for safety, and the environment generally, are conducive to the students' learning new occupations and improving their basic educational competencies.

Senator **Randolph**. I, of course, am supportive of your position, but I am only saying that the questioning indicated that perhaps some were better than others, and so forth. Rather than being better than others or worse than others, there are the natural variables that we must understand in the type of camp and the work that is done by the Job Corps.

Mr. **Jones**. Yes, sir.

The **Chairman**. As I understand it, you had 255 staffers back in 1979, and you are now down to 197. However, you feel you can get by with that many? You would like more, but as long as the budget $600 million, you feel you can get by? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. **Rell**. Yes. I believe that we can carry out our responsibilities at that level.

The **Chairman**. It is a significant reduction, though. It is about 20 percent.

Mr. **O'Keefe**. Senator, it occurs in the context, I think, of improved administration of the Employment and Training Administration across the board.

In Mr. Rell, we have one of our finest senior managers running the program. He is bringing to bear many management improvements that were not there in 1979.

We also have present a very vigil office of the inspector general. Within ETA we have an office of Program and Fiscal Integrity, which further bolsters our oversight of the programs. I think there are resources outside those roughly 200 people.

The **Chairman**. OK, but you know what I am concerned about. We had $600-plus million in 1981 in the budget. Now it is down to $600 million. Even though a slight increase in inflation during those years, we really have not increased the budget.

Second, we are talking about people here, young men and women, who really do not have any hope anywhere else. They just do not have a chance. To me, a great society should take care and provide opportunities for those who cannot help themselves.

I think we provide a lot of opportunities for those who can but won't when we ought to be doing more for those who really can't, especially when you have the success ratio that the Job Corps really provides.

I understand why Dave Stockman and others at OMB wanted to cut out Job Corps at a savings of $618 million at one point. Frankly, they did not yet understand how important this program is and what it really does. They have the job to try to get the budget under control, and everybody knows it is running out of control.

I think we ought to cut other programs that really are not doing the job and increase the ones that really are. That is what I am concerned about here, because I see these young kids who come out of there, who get jobs and become constructive contributors to society, compared to what they would have been. They would have been dependent on society for all of their lives if they had not had this Job Corps experience.

I really believe we need to advocate a little stronger for the Job Corps, and at the same time maybe advocate a little stronger—and Senator Randolph and I can work on the other side of that—for savings in some of these programs where people could do a little more for themselves, because they have the capacity, the education, and the opportunities. Maybe we ought to quit supporting so many of those programs so we can do an even better job with the [illegible]s.

That is why I like the handicapped programs. A lot of those people can help themselves. They just need a break. They just need an opportunity.

I think that is what the Federal Government role really can and should be.

Senator **Randolph**. I mention only one program as our able chairman mentions the word "handicapped." Let us remember today the opposition that we had to legislation I offered in 1936, to give the blind of our country an opportunity to be entrepreneurs in the marketplace. I remember so very well those hearings. I consistently heard from the witness table and others that it was all very well to have a feeling toward the blind, but they could not do these jobs. They could not do them.

The program was to give the blind the opportunity to operate vending facilities in all the Federal buildings of the United States, where it was practical. I report to you that in 1982 we had 3,729 blind persons who are self-employed, you realize. They are operating these facilities, and are employing others.

Take a trip downtown to the Justice Department and see the operation of the vending facility there. Blind vendors had average earnings in 1982 of $16,007. These were people that we had asked to sit in dark corners from almost the beginning of their lives.

I remember hearings where someone said, "But they can't do these jobs." Let's say, as I said then, "Well, let's give them the opportunity. If it fails, of course then we have failed."

In 1982 blind vendors sold about 269 million dollars' worth of items that people buy in this country. The program is not now only in Federal buildings, but it is also in State buildings.

As the chairman so correctly says, give people the opportunity to work rather than to receive relief.

Do you agree with that sort of thinking?

Mr. **Rell**. Yes, sir. That is what the Job Corps is all about, sir.

Senator **Randolph**. It is all about that, absolutely.

The **Chairman**. I suggest that we ought to do more to perhaps strengthen it even though we have terrible budget problems. We cannot solve every problem in society through the central form of government. There have to be volunteer organizations and a lot of other things, but I think that it worries me that we have had so many attacks on Job Corps, and in light of the record the Job Corps has.

There are deficiencies. We know there are some situations where it really does not function the way it should function. We know that there are deficiencies in architectural and engineering standards, for example. But, across the board, it is a program that everyone who looks at the Job Corps seriously, realizes the problems that these youth have in society, looks at the success of the program, cannot help but support it.

Let me ask just one other question because I have to get to the next panel. You have been very helpful to us here today.

Would you explain the Department of Labor's rationale for setting aside the longstanding contract with the Joint Action and Community Service, the JACS organization, and trying to put the recruitment of followup functions out for competitive bid?

Mr. O'**Keefe**. The decision made approximately 1 year ago to put out for competition the contract to which you refer was based on the underlying policy of the Job Corps and the Employment and Training Administration and the Department generally that competition will achieve for us the optimum mix of service level and cost that, as administrators of the moneys that you appropriate to us, we have a responsibility for spending as best we can.

The JACS contract is one which is being competed regionally at the present time. They are still in business through the remainder of this fiscal year. I believe it is through the fiscal year.

As you know, we recently had some litigation on that. We were taken to court. Last night Judge Oberdorfer's ruling came out in favor of the Department, upholding our basic commitment there to competing that contract.

The **Chairman**. All right. That is very helpful.

Senator Randolph?

Senator **Randolph**. I think that you have been very forthright in answering questions and giving initiatives from the witness table as well as to consider our questions.

I ask you, are you in favor of farming out this program or keeping it as it is now within the Park Service and other agencies?

Mr. **O'Keefe**. Senator, we are committed—your question goes to the administration of centers by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior—we are committed across the board to making those centers competitive with the centers that are administered by the Department of Labor. There is a significant cost differential among the centers based on whether they are CCC versus those which the Department competes. It is in that context that we are currently discussing with Agriculture and Interior how best to bring those costs—to close that gap.

Senator **Randolph**. Are you saying that those under the Park Service—for example, at Harpers Ferry—that that is a failure?

Mr. **O'Keefe**. No, sir. What I am saying is that there is a significant difference in the cost per Corps member that we serve there versus other centers throughout the country. What we want to achieve is a reduction in that differential, so that of the $600 million that we have, we can serve the largest number of participants. With any fixed budget, if the unit costs increase, that means that we will eventually result in serving fewer people.

Senator **Randolph**. However, you do not say necessarily that improvement cannot be made within the Park Service?

Mr. **O'Keefe**. We are discussing with Interior and Agriculture at the present time ways in which we can close that gap. Their involvement in the program is not something that we have closed out.

Senator **Randolph**. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

The **Chairman**. Thank you, Senator; we appreciate your questions.

Thank you all for coming. We appreciate the comments and your statements. We will look forward to receiving additional information which you are going to provide to us.

Our next panel will consist of four representatives from firms that operate the Job Corps Centers and provide training for the program's students: Mr. O.H. Simmons, corporate secretary of Minact, Inc., of Jackson, MI; Mr. John Gaines, president of Teledyne Economic Development Co., Los Angeles, CA; Mr. Herb Watkins, vice president of Career Systems at Singer Corp, Rochester, NY; and Dr. Robert L. Marquardt, the chairman and president of Management and Training Corp. in Ogden, UT.

Mr. Simmons, why don't we begin with you? In the interest of time, I would appreciate it if you would limit your oral presentation to no more than 5 minutes for each of you, because I would like to hear all four of you before I have to go to testify about our committee budget before the Rules Committee. I have to be there. I cannot miss that. However, I would like to hear all four you testify. Therefore, if you will limit your comments to 5 minutes, we will place all of your written statements into the record. We are building a record in this matter.

We will turn to you first, Mr. Simmons.

STATEMENT OF O.H. SIMMONS, CORPORATE SECRETARY, MINACT, INC., JACKSON, MS

Mr. Simmons. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity of being here to testify.

Before I came with Minact, which is a Mississippibased corporation that currently operates four Job Corps Centers, I served 41½ years with the Mississippi Employment Security Commission. When I retired, I was executive director of that organization. So I have had a number of years of experience in the various training programs operated by the Department of Labor and other Federal and State agencies.

After I graduated from high school, I entered the CCC and served a year in that. So I have had both ends of it. I was an enrollee in 1937 and 1938, prior to college.

Senator Randolph. Where did you do your CCC work?

Mr. Simmons. Richton, MS, Senator Randolph.

Senator Randolph. Then the structure, if I may say, was two pronged.

Mr. Simmons. Yes, sir.

Senator Randolph. The work in the field was civilian——

Mr. Simmons. Yes, sir.

Senator Randolph [continuing]. And in the camp operation——

Mr. Simmons. We were in the Army jurisdiction in the camps, yes.

The Chairman. Senator Randolph has been here 51 years—52 years, I guess. He knows all these programs.

Mr. Simmons. I have heard Senator Randolph give a history of the Wagner-Peyser Act on a couple different occasions. It is very enjoyable.

The Chairman. He has been making an attempt to educate me ever since I have been here, and he has done a pretty good job of it.

Senator Randolph. Just think of passing legislation today that would make it mandatory that a person in the program send so many dollars home to his father and mother or wife, and just wonder where you would get with that.

The Chairman. That is right. Go ahead, Mr. Simmons.

Mr. Simmons. We had that in the old CCC when I was going there.

Senator Randolph. Yes, sir.

Mr. Simmons. As has been indicated by you and some of the Department of Labor people, I just do not see how we can maintain the program that we have with $600 million, Senator Hatch and Senator Randolph. We had $618 million or better this year. With inflation, although inflation has slowed considerably, there is still that factor and it is going to require, in my opinion, additional funds above the $600 million.

Now in my experience with the Employment Security Commission, I began—in Mississippi we did all the recruitment and all the placement, and I can tell you from experience the Job Corps has the best success rate of any training program that has ever been operated or is currently being operated. That is not hearsay; that is from experience that I have had over the years.

You have indicated the need to upgrade some of the facilities, and there is no doubt that there is a big need in this area. With the $600 million, there is no way, in my opinion, that that is going to be able to be accomplished without cutting out some of the Corps members or cutting out even some of the centers.

There are some questions that have been asked this morning and some answers made on the vocational training. We need to maintain the state-of-the-art equipment in the vocational training area. Some of the centers, some of our centers, have very old equipment that we are trying to train the kids on. Now we have been very successful, but we do need to maintain the state of the art insofar as equipment is concerned that we are training on.

One of the things that has been mentioned already this morning in the basic education. We feel—and I certainly subscribe to this—that without adequate basic education you cannot absorb the vocational training in a lot of instances as needed. Therefore, we put a great deal of emphasis on basic education in our centers.

I was certainly happy to see that in Senate bill 2111 that you stressed this phase of the training program.

We also believe that residential living is an integral part of the training because so many of these youngsters, as has been intimated already here this morning, come from environments that are just—it is hard for us to realize what the environments are. Residential living is a very integral part in order to get them ready to enter the world of work and operate in the society in which we have to operate.

One of the things that I think we need to do is to look very closely at computer-based instruction in the basic education. This not only enhances the learning ability, but it cuts out some of the drudgery with the enrollees that we have.

We have in our St. Louis Center premilitary training, we call it, Senator Hatch. It is entirely voluntary, but this has been one of the best things insofar as generating pride, patriotism. It has given us a great deal of help with the Community Relations Council and through the general public. They see these kids in the premilitary training and the pride and patriotism. It enhances that. We just get a lot of support for that one voluntary program.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with that. We have that out in Utah, and it really creates discipline and a lot of other things.

Mr. Simmons, your 5 minutes are up. Do you have any other major point?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do want to say that insofar as the private contractors are concerned, I think that the private sector—going to the private sector is in keeping with the intent of the Job Training Partnership Act that was enacted a couple years ago by the Congress.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Simmons follows:]

Testimony before
The Senate Labor Committee

November 15, 1983

My name is O. H. Simmons. I am Corporate Secretary of MINACT, Inc., a Mississippi based corporation that currently operates four job corps centers. These centers are located in Knoxville (Tennessee), Batesville (Mississippi), St. Louis and Excelsior Springs, Missouri. Prior to my joining MINACT, Inc., I spent forty-one and one-half years with the Mississippi Employment Security Commission and at my retirement was Executive Director of that organization. During my tenure with the Mississippi Employment Security Commission, I had an opportunity to be involved in job corps operations since its inception in 1965. Before entering college and immediately after graduation from high school in 1937, I entered the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) which in reality is the forerunner of the job corps program. For these reasons I feel I am eminently qualified to present testimony to this Committee concerning the effectiveness and needs of the Job Corps program.

There is no question that we need to maintain a budget of at least $18 million dollars for FY 85 since there are currently thousands of youth who are waiting to take advantage of the excellent training they can receive through this program. The unemployment statistics for young people, particularly minority youth, vividly points up this need. Mississippi youth have always taken advantage of the Job Corps program in relatively large numbers. Through my work with the Employment Security Commission, I was able to see the excellent training that is taking place throughout the United States. In fact, for a number of years Mississippi had a one of the highest placement rate of returning job corps enrollees of any state even during the current tough economic times, the rate has not shown any substantial drop. For this reason, I consider Job Corps to be the most successful training program currently being operated.

A decrease in funding for this program would cause a farther deterioration in the training facilities, many of which are in dire need of renovation and maintenance. You are aware of course, that the majority of the centers were built for some other purpose than Job Corps activities and were renovated to accommodate the program. Many of these facilities are old and require a great deal of maintenance and rehabilitation. Many are badly in need of capital improvements to bring them or keep them up to the minimum standards that are required to train young people.

Although placement has been good to excellent historically, I am concerned about equipment for the vocational skills that are currently being offered which, in many instances, has not kept pace with "the state of the art." It is imperative that in order for the job corps graduates to remain competitive in the workforce that they must be trained on the latest equipment being used by industry throughout the country in the particular occupation for which they receive training. Many of the centers need funds to upgrade equipment so that the young people can be adequately trained to meet the needs of the labor force.

Contractors (operators) are continually striving to improve the basic education programs for the enrollees and we consider this the "cornerstone" of the total program. Without proper basic education, it is almost impossible for a young person to adequately absorb the vocational/technical training being offered. New techniques for improving the basic education instruction are continually being developed and it is imperative that the job corps stay abreast and provide the latest techniques and equipment for this important phaze of the youth's training.

In an attempt to keep pace with the recent technological trend which currently exist in our society, there is an urgent need to implement Computer-Based Instruction in the Job Corps training programs.

Computer Based Instruction is one of the newer trends to improve educational effectiveness in the classroom. It enhances the ability of individual teachers to reach students while, at the same time reduce drudgery of repetitive teaching on the enrollees. Moreover, Computer Based Education greatly enhances the overall learning process.

Residential living quarters are in many instances badly in need of capital improvements and funds have not been available in the last several years to provide the renovations which are needed. We at MINACT, Inc. consider the residential living component an integral part of the training since many of the enrollees come from environments that do not adequately instill in them the values that society will demand of them when they become workers in the industrial complex.

Due to the unsettled situation throughout the world we are convinced that pre-military training is a strong plus for job corps enrollees . We have this training at the St. Louis Center and it has proven to be very popular with the corpsmembers. It has brought a strengthening of support from the community relations council and the general public, who are highly complimentary concerning the pride and patriotism that is being generated through the pre-military program.

The Advanced Career Training program needs to be reinstituted. Many corpsmembers have benefited from this program in the past and many more can still benefit from such a program. Through the Advanced Training Program, several students have completed advanced level degrees, and have done exceptionally well in their areas of expertise. We hasten to point out that funding for this component should be separate and apart from the regular program.

We feel that the awarding of contracts to private industry for the operation of the job corps centers is the most effective way to operate and we encourage expansion and continuation of this method for ensuring the most cost-effective and best training available for our young people. In our opinion this is in keeping with the recently enacted Job Corps Training Partnership Act that encuurages more involement in the private sector in the federally supported training programs. We at MINACT, Inc. are extremely proud of the success we have had in training the young people assigned to the centers which we operate and particularly in the records they have achieved.

The plea today, Mr. Chairman, is that sufficient funds be provided to improve upon the operations that are currently being carried out and that the regional and national staff be strengthened in order to assure that each contractor carries out the terms of his contract that will provide the maximum benefits to the youth of this country.

We appreciate most sincerely the opportunity of presenting this testimony and will be glad to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Gaines, let's turn to you. You are president of Teledyne Economic Development Co. We appreciate having you here today.

STATEMENT OF JOHN GAINES, PRESIDENT, TELEDYNE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CO., LOS ANGELES, CA

Mr. GAINES. It is a pleasure to be here.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I said before, it is certainly a pleasure to be here and discuss a program that I have heard nothing but good things about today, and I am certainly pleased to have heard all these.

The Teledyne Corp. operates nine Job Corps Centers throughout the United States. One of these Centers is located in Gainesville, FL. We have a supervisor at that Center named Randy Bennett. He was an eighth grade dropout. He joined Job Corps a few years ago and received 18 months' training at the Earl C. Clements Job Corps Center in Kentucky. This was not a Teledyne center. As a matter of fact, it was run by the Singer Corp., my compatriot on the left. I have to say that.

The CHAIRMAN. That transcends paternalism. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES. During that training he received his GED [his general equivalency diploma], that you mentioned before, and vocational skills training. He then, through an ACT Program that is a portion of the Job Corps, and which at this moment has been somewhat downplayed, but ACT puts out money to deserving students who are able to qualify for college and it is a minor part of Job Corps at this moment, but during the time this young man was in his training he did get ACT funds through Job Corps and attended a college called Lane in Jackson, TN, where he got a BA in sociology. Mind you, I am talking about an eighth grade dropout at this moment in time.

In 1979 Teledyne employed him to work in our Gainesville Job Corps Center, and in October 1982 this young man was invited to Washington to attend the signing of the new Job Training Partnership Act, which I guess they call JTPA, or I am not quite sure of the short terminology for it, but it is the Job Training Partnership Act.

I would like to read his company trip report, and it is very short. I know I only have 5 minutes, but I think you will enjoy listening to it. Again, I repeat, this is an eighth grade dropout that we are starting with, and here is what he is saying. He sent this to his supervisor who sent it to his supervisor, who sent it to someone, who sent it to me. It appeared on my desk, and here is what he says:

"I arrived at the Department of Labor Building in Washington, DC, at 10 a.m. on October 13, 1982, and was introduced to several Job Corps officials and several Department of Labor officials. From there, we departed for the White House at 10:30 a.m.

"We entered the White House gates at 10:45 a.m. with two other Job Corps graduates and 15 graduates from various job training programs. We were greeted in the White House reception room by several White House officials and Secretary Donovan.

"From there, we were taken to the Cabinet Room where we had the opportunity to talk with Mr. Donovan about the new Jobs Training Program. At that time President Reagan came into the room. We were all introduced to him and had the opportunity to ask him questions and say a little something about ourselves.

"I indicated to President Reagan that, prior to entering the Job Corps Program, I had an eighth grade education with very little opportunity to do any better whatsoever, but, thanks to Job Corps, I was able to get my GED, skill training, and a college diploma. I explained to him that since being with Job Corps I had had the opportunity to see and hear thousands of young people being helped by this program. I indicated to the President that I would sincerely like to thank him for his support of the Job Corps Program.

"After a round of jelly beans and several waves of photographers, we left the Cabinet Room for the Executive Office Building, where we lined up on stage for the signing of the Jobs Training Partnership Act.

"While I stood beside Secretary Donovan, President Reagan delivered a speech to White House officials and a number of reporters. He indicated in his speech that those present were examples of training for jobs where individuals can become taxpayers, not tax burdens.

"We all gathered behind the President while he signed the new bill into law. The President then asked us all a few questions. When he was preparing to leave the room, I had the opportunity to shake his hand and indicate to the President that it was a pleasure to meet him."

That, members of this committee, in my opinion, is what Job Corps is all about. The key words here are, "taxpayers, not tax burdens." I know, Mr. Chairman, you indicated that quite eloquently earlier, but I want to repeat it again. My God, it's "taxpayers, not tax burdens," and that is the key to this whole program.

The approximately 80,000 young people, ages 16 to 21, who receive training each year are from poverty level families, as was indicated. I have been watching all of this for 20 years and have been responsible for my particular center during those years, and I cannot emphasize that enough.

I know I come from the "land of milk and honey" out there in California, but, by God, when I have seen some of those kids and where they come from and what they are able to do after this training, it has to tear you up.

They come to Job Corps with fifth grade reading and math skill levels, and that is another difficult thing. I know this was brought up before, but I wanted to make a point of it again. That is what we are dealing with. They are unemployable. The Job Corps gives them a chance to become taxpaying citizens.

During the 18 years that I and Teledyne have been involved in this program, I have read many letters similar to the story about Randy Bennett—not with the jelly beans and the current President, but, nevertheless, many stories that, if you read them, it has to really get to you.

I have to say from my standpoint—and we, Teledyne, are involved in a lot of other activities, aerospace, and so forth and so on, which are certainly important to this country. However, this program, when you really get into it, is beyond belief and it is gratifying to me to note—I know you have been to Clearfield, and I know that several others on the committee have been around to the various centers. With regard to the centers that Teledyne runs, we had Senator Hawkins from your committee visit our centers in Florida. We have had Senator Nickles visit our center in Oklahoma, Guthrie, OK. Senator Kennedy has visited our center in Grafton, MA.

I will tell you, I believe a visit to any Job Corps Center makes it plain to see why Job Corps is a success.

I have submitted a prepared statement, which is longer than what I have been through.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we will put it in the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gaines follows:]

TELEDYNE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMPANY
11340 West Olympic Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90064

Testimony of
John W. Gaines
President
Teledyne Economic Development Company
Before the
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate
on
The Job Corps Program

Introduction

Teledyne has been operating Job Corps Centers for the past eighteen (18) years. We currently operate Centers in Phoenix, Arizona; Tucson, Arizona; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Roswell, New Mexico; Guthrie, Oklahoma, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Grafton, Massachusetts; Gainesville, Florida and Jacksonville, Florida. The following statement covers:

Job Corps Budget and Personnel
Basic Job Corps Programs
Job Corps Center Facilities
Additional Job Corps Programs

All of the following comments concern TRAINING. Training is what this program is all about. The Job Corps enrolls disadvantaged young people (ages 16-21) who are usually high school dropouts -- with no place to go but down -- and trains them. Trains them to be PRODUCTIVE - EMPLOYABLE CITIZENS. It is not an easy task. It is a task this country cannot afford to ignore. It is a task that is now being done by JOB CORPS. The direct and indirect dollar return to the United States Taxpayer far exceeds the cost of this program.

Job Corps Budget and Personnel

Job Corps is the most successful social laboratory in the country to research and implement methods of breaking the poverty cycle. The great strides made by the program over the past eighteen (18) years have proven this repeatedly. If a corpsmember is to succeed in a job, he or she, must possess skills in five interrelated areas: Vocational, educational, physical, living and social. This is what Job Corps provides. As Mathematica Policy Research of Princeton, New Jersey has found, "the average investment per corpsmember is paid back in approximately three years". With the proven success rate of the more than 1,000,000 youngsters who have profited by Job Corps, it can be truly said that congressional appropriations have been and continue to be well spent. In terms of real dollars, the budget for Job Corps has decreased over the years but Job Corps has steadily improved its program. I hardly need say that the employment situation for the youth of this country needs special attention. Basic skills and attitudes necessary for employment are of utmost importance. Job Corps is a successful vehicle for providing disadvantaged youth with these skills. It is an outstanding demonstration of the joining of industry, labor, government and youth into a successful program. Budget considerations continues to plague us all. I am sure that when your committee reviews the Job Corps budget for FY'84 and future years, this worthwhile program will receive the consideration it deserves.

A matter of concern in the personnel area, is the current DOL "RIF" policies. The loss and replacement of DOL personnel possessing many years of experience in Job Corps is creating a "knowledge gap" which is hurting this program. We all recognize the tremendous pressure government is under regarding budgets. However, there is a great need for stable and experienced government personnel for this program and I hope all due consideration can be given to maintaining qualified DOL staff.

Vocational and Skills Training

The vocational learning environment at Job Corps Centers manifests the philosophy of individualized training, complimented by the development of skills and confidence in each corpsmember. The Center's vocational training is designed with a focus on each individual's current position in the working world, his/her employment expectations, and the establishment of realistic goals and development of skills to attain them.

Curriculum insures that individual abilities are exercised in the acquisition of specific skills required for employment. Opportunity is continually available to practice these skills in order to stimulate motivation. Motivation is further increased through progressive accomplishment of tasks. All training experiences are directly supported by vocationally related reading and math.

Job Corps is well aware that conventional methods of training have not worked in the Job Corps target population. Therefore, instructional techniques and methods are designed to cope with corpsmembers who have a history of difficulty in training or negative attitudes toward it.

The Job Corps Program teaches young people how to work. Job Corps has been a national leader in developing competency based vocational programs within the system. This vocational improvement effort with all its thrust must be maintained. I urge the Senate to take special care to see that these efforts of the Department of Labor continue to receive the necessary attention for success.

Basic Education

The Job Corps education program emphasizes basics. Reading and math skills are stressed. The acquisition of a GED, for those without a high school diploma, is paramount for job placement in many occupations. Training in other social and living skills takes place to address behaviors which have caused the youth problems at home and at work.

We have developed within Job Corps a very strong and successful basic education program geared towards individuals moving at their own pace to reach common goals. The GED program developed for Job Corps is utilized by many non-Job Corps organizations. Teledyne is particularly proud of a Learning Disabilities program developed by the Gainesville Center in conjunction with the University of Florida. This program is the most extensive one of its kind dealing with adolescent learning problems. It will soon be utilized nationally. These programs illustrate the Basic Education areas strengths.

Job Corps has designed a program that blends superior instruction with sensitivity to the needs of the disadvantaged young person. Learning is made interesting, individualized to the corpsmember's abilities and interests, and geared to the demands of the job market.

Job Corps defines learning as an interaction with one's environment that prompts a change in behavior. The challenge for the Job Corps staff is to direct corpsmember's interactions with their environment so as to help them deal more successfully with the working world.

Job Corps taps corpsmember's innate capacity to master tasks they have not attempted. First, it stimulates their desire to learn and persevere in the task; and, second, it allows them the time their abilities require to master it.

Accordingly, Job Corps is guided by the following precepts in designing the Job Corps Center's educational training program to be of greatest benefit to the corpsmembers:

- Individualized instruction promotes effective learning.

- Most corpsmembers can master the learning task if it is presented effectively and if they are allowed as much time to practice and absorb it as their individual ability requires.

- In order to be mastered, a learning experience must be meaningful to the learner. Instructors should continually demonstrate how the subject matter will be useful to corpsmembers.

- Learning is measurable and should be measured.

- o Effective learning requires the learner's active participation.

- o The goal of learning is to enable the learner to apply knowledge, skills, or attitudes to his/her own life.

The education staff of the Job Corps gives all corpsmembers individual attention to insure that they have the opportunity to leave the program with a GED, to master the skills needed to locate and progress in a job that offers upward mobility, and to attain the self-confidence and knowledge necessary to live independently while working with others in our society.

To meet corpsmember's needs, the education staff works closely with individual corpsmembers in three main areas:

Academic education (math, reading, and GED)--to help corpsmembers acquire all the knowledge and skills they are capable of attaining.

Vocational support to prepare corpsmembers with the skills necessary to find and keep the job that offers upward mobility. The academic education staff works with the vocational staff in developing vocational vocabulary sheets and writing corpsmember activity guides to enable corpsmembers to understand the vocational materials used in the various shops.

Social development to encourage personal growth, social skills, and independence.

These three areas work in conjunction with all components of the Center to assure that corpsmembers receive a well developed and thorough training experience.

Residential Living

The aspect of Job Corps which truly distinguishes it from the majority of other training programs is its residential element. Center Life includes many components -- counseling, orientation, recreation, health services, enrollee support, and, of course, residential living. All of these areas assist the youth to live independently after leaving the program.

During the past three (3) years, Job Corps has made a concerted effort to improve this area. A Training Academy for Residential Advisors has been established at the Clearfield, Utah Center.

Emphasis has been placed on group dynamics and intergroup relations. The residential living program is designed to provide corpsmembers with the maximum opportunity to develop patterns of living that help them succeed in their educational and vocational training and build a rewarding personal life. Positive behavioral change can be produced only in an environment of trust, confidence, and successful experiences. The residential program provides a base of stability, must motivate the corpsmember to change unacceptable behavior, and continues long enough for the corpsmember to feel comfortable and secure in new patterns of living and behavior.

To create such an environment, Job Corps has designed the residential living program to meet the following objectives:

> Provide each corpsmember with safe, secure, and healthful physical surroundings.
>
> Enable each corpsmember to better cope with the demands of living as a responsible member of society and to relate to peers and authorities.
>
> Provide professional counseling to meet individual needs.
>
> Promote interest in productive leisure experiences.
>
> Reinforce positive behavioral change by giving praise, privileges, and greater responsibility.

Desired corpsmember behavior is maintained by specifying a minimal number of rules consistent with Job Corps requirements, acquainting staff and corpsmembers with the need for them, and training the staff in enforcing them appropriately.

Physical Plants

The physical plants of Job Corps are as diverse as there are Job Corps Centers. Continuous work needs to be done on these sites to keep them at proper health and safety levels for corpsmembers in their training. I urge continued attention to the Job Corps facilities which now exist.

Equipment Needs

As well as Job Corps does in its vocational training efforts, it has been hampered by the lack of funds to utilize current training equipment. Corpsmembers, when placed on Work Experience, are often confronted with machinery they have never seen. We view the ability of Job Corps to keep current with the needs of the vocational trades now being offered at Center's as one of the most important requirements of the future Job Corps vocational program.

Pre-Military

Teledyne supports the proposed relationship between Job Corps and the various branches of the Armed Services. Our understanding of the program, is that youth which attempt to enlist but fail the Armed Services Vocational Appitude Battery are referred by the military recruiter to the Job Corps program. These youth will be sent to selected centers to receive up to a year of academic and pre-military training (no weapons). After such training and assuming the individual can now pass the ASVAB, he/she will be inducted into his/her selected military branch.

Pre-military enrollment in Job Corps by youth interested in joining the armed forces should be encouraged. The system will provide these pre-military youth training with their peers. Job Corps can contribute significantly to the military readiness of the country by the use of its basic skills program. The adjustment that youth can make during their group life experiences will profit the military in many different ways. I urge the support of this program as it enters its first phase of experimentation.

National Training Academies

During the past two years, the Residential Training Academy located at the Clearfield Job Corps Center has trained residential staff from across the country in successful techniques to manage Center Life programs. All staff from Teledyne Centers who have attended have greatly complimented their training experience. We support this program and urge its continuance.

Advance Career Training

The ACT Program, while in existence from 1978 through 1981, gave those qualified corpsmembers an opportunity to enroll in college and fully realize their potential. Teledyne believes that the Advanced Career Training Program (ACT) is a very worthwhile adjutant to basic Job Corps. We strongly recommend that this program be continued within budgetary considerations.

In closing, I would like to comment to this Committee, that Job Corps may be compared to another program supported by Congress. I compare the Job Corps program with the GI Bill which was passed shortly after World War II. The GI Bill legislation has proven to be one of the wisest legislative bills passed and supported by Congress in this century. I believe Job Corps, although on a smaller scale, can be included in this category.

Thank you for this opportunity to share with you, my insights concerning Job Corps.

The **Chairman**. We appreciate your testimony.

I might mention that I am being staffed this morning by Jerry Bond, who is a Job Corps graduate, who went on to Weber State College and became a great football star there, and is going to continue his education while he works with me.

I understand what you are saying.

I was headed for Europe and I was at Kennedy Airport. My wife, Elaine, and I were walking down the aisle or down the ramp, and there was this very dignified young black woman there who was walking, and we passed her. We got about three or four steps beyond her, and she said, "Senator Hatch?"

I said, "Yes." I said, "Do I know you?"

I could not help but notice her because she was so composed, and she just looked like the model of confidence.

She said, "Well, I met you up at the Clearfield Job Corps Center."

I said, "Well, what are you doing here?"

She said, "I just graduated from the Clearfield Job Corps Center."

I said, "What are you going to do?"

She said, "I am a graduate, and I am here to get a job."

She had so much confidence and poise that there is no doubt in my mind that she not only got a job, but she is going to be one of these terrific people who make so much difference in our society.

You just have to have a few of those experiences and you realize what a great job you people do.

Mr. **Gaines**. How true.

The **Chairman**. Now, there are some who are not doing a great job. We want to upgrade those.

We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. Watkins, we know that Singer does a lot of work in this area. We appreciate having you here. We will turn to your testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF HERB W. WATKINS, VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL MANAGER, THE SINGER CO., CAREER SYSTEM, ROCHESTER, NY

Mr. **Watkins**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am general manager of Career Systems, a division and operation of the Singer Co. We operate 12 Job Corps Centers.

Our experience, however, is far broader than just Job Corps operations. We have conducted programs in public schools, on Indian reservations, in correctional institutions, in industry, and for the U.S. military.

Our vocational assessment system, which we developed primarily for Job Corps purposes, is used in over a thousand public and private schools, vocational rehabilitation facilities, and other contract operations. We are marketing vocational assessment and training programs as well as products to the JTPA service delivery area.

In 1983 we operated two JTPA dislocated worker programs. I mention this only to give validity to the statement I am about to make.

In our judgment, Job Corps is the most successful program for training disadvantaged youth, and particularly the hardest to employ segment.

I have seen the program in my years come under attack at different times and during different administrations. It has survived because of its widespread, bipartisan congressional support—support, I believe, that is engendered by proven performance.

I am less concerned now with the program's continuation as I am about its possible erosion because of a desire for cost savings regardless of the impact on the program. If you are going to have a program, let's at least fund the program at an adequate level to do the job that the program is designed to do.

The Job Corps is being expected to operate at the lowest budget in recent years and at the lowest number of staff in the national and regional offices. Authorized positions in Job Corps regional offices decreased by over 40 percent, 42.8 percent to be exact, in the same 5-year period that enrollment increased by 82.8 percent and the number of centers expanded by 77.9 percent.

It is my opinion, sir, that any additional reductions in staff and continuing changes of personnel can only harm the Job Corps Program.

I believe that contractors today are operating centers with the maximum accountability. Extensive audits over the past year did not uncover any significant mismanagement or fraud or abuse.

At our largest center, where over 8 contract years were audited, over $100 million of contract dollars, the auditors found absolutely no disallowed expense, no questionable cause.

In the case of serious incidents which are of legitimate concern in areas where centers are located, I submit that the number of serious incidents committed by youth enrolled in Job Corps is far less than the rate of occurrence among similar youth in the general population. The emphasis on reporting of serious incidents at Job Corps Centers cannot be allowed to diminish the much more significant and positive actions of these young adults during their Job Corps enrollment.

I am simply saying, look at the positive side of this and the gain is highly significant.

At the same time I would urge that private operators of Job Corps Centers should be provided the same protection from lawsuits for liability for serious incidents as is the Government under the Federal Torts Claim Act.

Singer's involvement in JTPA's dislocated worker programs confirmed that less skilled workers are simply in less demand. Job Corps must recognize this by upgrading the centers' training facilities and equipment and offering more advanced training at the centers.

A major difference between JTPA or vocational education programs and Job Corps is the residential nature of Job Corps. There is no question that the removal of disadvantaged youth from home environments and peer group influences, that often create negative attitudes toward learning, work, and responsible citizenship, is essential in dealing with this hardest-to-employ segment.

A major requirement of any increased funding is to improve the facilities, particularly the older Centers, with space inadequacies and in need of repairs and improvements.

Corps members in the building trade skills—and I would like particularly to mention this—where they are taught by unions, the National Association of Homebuilders, or contracts, are capable of tremendous construction work for renovating Job Corps facilities. They need some money for materials.

By working on these projects, Corps members gain realistic training and pride in their visible accomplishments. Obviously, I believe there is more yet to be done to continue the record of excellence for which Job Corps is known.

The program has proven effective, and it deserves protection against inadequate funding, administrative—I will use the word—"overkill," because I think excessive audits after the fact are diverting moneys that could be used for program enhancement, or the lack of program improvement.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Watkins follows:]

Testimony by H.W. Watkins, Vice President and General Manager, The Singer Company, Career Systems

Before the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee

February 8, 1984

I am Herbert W. Watkins, Vice President and General Manager of the Career Systems operation of The Singer Company. Singer currently manages 12 Job Corps centers under contract to the U.S. Department of Labor, through its Employment and Training Administration. Two years ago, we operated an equal number of vocational assessment and training programs funded through various titles of the CETA legislation. We are marketing similar programs and related products to the newly formed JTPA service delivery areas, as well as to other government agencies, to the military and to industry, principally in the United States. We have also operated programs in the public schools, in vocational rehabilitation facilities and in correctional institutions.

The Job Corps program remains our base of greatest experience, as well as the largest percentage of our annual sales. I personally became involved with Job Corps when it was still under the auspices of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In its almost 20-year history, the program has come under attack several times, from different Administrations. It has survived largely because of widespread and bipartisan Congressional support engendered by the program's effectiveness with the disadvantaged young men and women who have enrolled in Job Corps.

I am not concerned now as to the program's continuation as much as I am about its possible erosion from the desire for cost savings regardless of the ultimate expense to this program.

The Job Corps budget in the Fiscal Year 1984 appropriations bill, the lowest in recent years, results in a 10 percent cut from the 1983 operating budget. The reduction is even greater for program year 1985, because there will be no carry-in monies nor is there any provision, in either year, for an inflationary factor.

Job Corps has also suffered serious personnel reductions, particularly at the Regional Office levels. In the five years between 1978 and 1983, the number of enrollees increased 82.8 percent and the number of centers expanded by 77.9 percent. Authorized positions in Job Corps Regional Offices, however, decreased by 42.8 percent. Experienced Job Corps staff have been "bumped out" by senior transfers from other ETA functions--generally CETA and Employment Service. The majority of these individuals do not appear to have the same interest or competency, based upon experience, of those they replaced. The contractors' job has been made more difficult in light of this lack of knowledge and continuity for evaluating bid proposals, selecting contractors, conducting center reviews and acting on requests for approval. There are increasing requirements for the contractors, with less capability for corresponding responsiveness by the government.

I believe that the contractors are operating centers under the maximum degree of accountability possible. Extensive audits have been conducted during the past year. Despite some preconceived notions to the contrary, the audits simply did not uncover any significant mismanagement of government funds, nor did they indicate fraud or abuse on the part of Job Corps operators. At Singer's largest center, the auditing of over $121,693,780 expenditures, covering eight contract years, found absolutely no disallowed costs and, more surprising perhaps, zero dollars of questioned costs.

Another area of concern to the Congressional districts where centers are located is the occurrence of significant incidents, ranging from assaults and other serious criminal actions to those which may simply lead to negative and often uninformed media or citizen attention. I submit that the number of serious incidents committed by the young people in Job Corps is far less than the rate of occurrence among similar populations in the public schools. I believe that it is time that this matter be put in proper perspective in regard to its not becoming a "witch hunt" issue diminishing the much more significant and positive actions of these young people during their Job Corps enrollment. I would urge also that operators of Job Corps centers should be provided a degree of protection from third-party law suits, as is the government under the Federal Tort Claims Act. Our corporate attorneys have drafted such a possible amendment to the Job Training Partnership Act.

Another area that private business contractors, particularly those representing large industrial corporations, should be concerned about is the quality of the vocational training. I personally believe that the true mission of Job Corps remains the same as that of the Job Training Partnership Act, which is, training leading to gainful employment. We must upgrade the centers' training facilities, equipment and teaching methods and make certain that we are training in the correct skills needed by employers today and in the near future. The Ford Foundation has been warning us for some time that technical skill requirements for entry-level jobs are rising. Singer's recent work with two JTPA Dislocated Worker programs confirmed that companies are using technology and their work forces to improve their productivity and quality control. Less skilled workers are simply in less demand. Job Corps and JTPA must acknowledge this reality.

Clearly, the residential nature of Job Corps adds to its cost, through related support staff, facilities and functions. Just as clearly, residential living at Job Corps provides an opportunity for the individual youth to mature, much as for the college student away from home for the first time. It is especially necessary for young people in this population--many of whom have home environments and peer group influences that have produced negative attitudes toward learning, work and society's objectives of responsible citizenship. By contrast, Job Corps dormitory life fosters cooperation, racial/ethnic understanding, and a pride and respect for one's living conditions.

Many of these Job Corps facilities need improvement. Health and safety codes must be met, certainly, but more attention should be paid, as well, to classroom and other space inadequacies. Corpsmembers in the building trade skills, whether taught by unions, the National Association of Home Builders, or the contractors, are capable of tremendous construction work. If the funding is made sufficient for these projects, existing centers, particularly the older, larger sites, can be improved and even expanded to serve more youths while offering practical training experience.

In closing, this program is proven effective and it deserves protection against inadequate funding or other harmful actions.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Watkins.

I would like to say to everybody here that I think Bob Marquardt and Bernie Diamond, who is seated behind him, have done more to help me understand Job Corps, the problems and the benefits of Job Corps, than any two people. I have had a lot of help from a lot of other people as well, but I really appreciate the efforts that they have put forth in their own quiet ways to try to help me understand how important this program is. They started right after I got elected to the Senate and put on this committee. I really appreciate the efforts that you have put forth, both of you.

Bob, we will turn to you at this time.

If you could limit your remarks to about 5 minutes, I hate to cut you off but we want to ask a few questions before I leave.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. MARQUARDT, CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT, MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING CORP., OGDEN, UT

Mr. Marquardt. Thank you for your kind words, Mr. Chairman, and for the opportunity to be here and represent Management and Training Corp.

I would like to begin by also giving an accolade to Jerry Bond and Kris Iverson on your committee. They do great work in supporting this in the private sector. They keep us informed. They ask for our ideas. I think that it is an outstanding committee.

Jerry Bond did graduate from Job Corps, and certainly he is the epitome of what we are talking about here today—success.

I want to compliment and second my peers' comments. I certainly agree with them all. Being in a wrap-up position, I will try to hit some points that perhaps they did not hit as hard as I would have.

I have also submitted a paper for the record, and will try to depart from that at this point and mention some general comments.

I certainly give an accolade to the DOL administrators of the administration. They have brought many efficiencies in the procurement area. They have started some initiatives in the capital area that are long overdue. Literally, at Job Corps Centers we have had little or no equipment and capital rehab upgrading for the past 3 years.

They can talk openly about modernizing to today's industry, but if there is not money for the modern equipment to go along with today's careers, obviously the Centers cannot go into that area. I think they certainly need to put the dollars with the new careers if, indeed, we are going to modernize our career offerings.

I think there is a peril in approaching literally the same budget year after year. For the past 3 years, as contractors, we have been told to either reduce our budgets or to have a very modest increase. We have done that, and we have done that successfuly, but I think there is the point where you cannot continue to take out of labor and you cannot continue to take out of employment benefits and hold the quality of the program. I, indeed, think that $600 million is not a fair number for Job Corps, and it needs to be reexamined. I think it should be upward——

The Chairman. If you were asked what would be a fair number, what would you say?

Mr. Marquardt. Certainly, from the operational sense, something more like $615 to $620 million would be the number that I would seek, plus the capital and equipment that is needed. I think really what is vitally needed is a long-term capital plan. I do not think Job Corps has had one for the 19 years that our company has participated with Job Corps.

The Chairman. I would like to hear from all four of you and other Job Corps leaders throughout the country on what you think you need as far as capital equipment. You are talking about $620 million, $20 million more than what we have featured in the budget, and what you need for capital equipment for the long term.

Mr. Marquardt. I have no visibility, Senator, in terms of the other companies' needs. I have heard their comments, but that needs to be examined by DOL center by center by center.

Another area that I think is suspect in terms of changes needed is in the 50-50 evaluation. Job Corps staff at the regional and Washington level has been cut for about 3 years in a row, and here we go on another cut.

Now it is very good, I think, administratively to say we can take another personnel cut. I, indeed, think they cannot take another personnel cut. I think the Job Corps Program has succeeded because of its supreme accountability, specificity is very detailed, and I do not think an administrator from another program can come in and summarily evaluate our proposals without causing problems in terms of not being fair to the incumbent centers and not being fair to experienced contractors. Maybe too many evaluations are coming out in an all-equal basis.

Right now I am specifically talking about the 50-50 condition, 50-50 evaluation, meaning 50 percent of the evaluators are non-Job Corps people. I think that started perhaps primarily because of lack of personnel at the regional level. They do not have sufficient personnel, in my judgment, to do the accountability audits that they need on even a yearly basis, but they certainly need to have experienced people doing evaluations of programs and proposals.

A bank would not have its books examined by an administrator who knows the food business or the health business. A new B-3 wing design would not have an administrator in food and health do a judgment in terms of the proposal aerodynamically, physically, et cetera. I think Job Corps is a very specific program, and I think the evaluation should be by people who know Job Corps, who have walked the centers, and indeed know what they are talking about.

In closing, I would like to give a comment. I have heard various numbers in terms of costs. The DOL officials talked about $13,000-plus as a high cost. They say expensive. I say it is a very cost-effective number, and I would like to make a comparison.

The average stay in Job Corps by a Job Corps student in fiscal year 1983 was 7.8 months. Doing a ratio on that 7.8 months, of the $13,262, really what you are talking about is an $8,620 training cost for all students going into Job Corps. That is the average cost. That compares highly in comparison to a JPTA cost of $5,900 for 3 months' skilled training only. It compares high in terms of maybe the overall voc-ed budget. However, the Job Corps costs involve the whole person.

When you talk to employers for OJT or placement, they are interested in a person who will come to work. They are interested in one who will communicate. They are interested in one who will get along with fellow employees. The social skills have to be taught.

I just walked into a center yesterday, one of our centers, Management and Training Corp., at Albany, GA. I looked at the computer runout: what were the average education and math skills of those students at that center? Average: third grade. I have brought the Sullivan Series of average three grades which I would like to submit and also the math for average three. I would like to let the committee examine what the potential capability of those people today of entering JTPA for skilled training and a job. The employers are not taking third grade, fourth grade, fifth grade, sixth grade, seventh grade into JPTA in the main.

The **Chairman**. What you are saying is that, as important as the Job Training Partnership Act is, it really isn't going to reach these people without the basic education the Job Corps will give them?

Mr. **Marquardt**. It certainly is not.

The **Chairman**. You will prepare them to enter into JTPA and perhaps even go way beyond that.

Mr. **Marquardt**. There are 1 million dropouts per year out of the public schools. Ninety percent of our students are dropouts. I think the average grade level is much lower than the sixth or seventh grade that has been talked about in years past. I think it is, indeed, the fifth grade, and in the Southern States it is around the third grade.

It is a marvelous program. Our company has been in training industrially, foreign, almost every department in the country, and this is the best return for the taxpayer.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Marquardt follows:]

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 5, 1984

BY

ROBERT L. MARQUARDT, PH.D.
CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT
MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING CORPORATION

Chairman Hatch, Members of the Committee, Guests....

It is indeed an honor for me to return to Congress to again testify in behalf of the status of your National Job Corps program. Your program is still the very best alternative offered to unemployed, unskilled youth. It is the most successful and comprehensive accountable training system available in the free world, with a very respectable job placement rate. Reportedly, in FY '83, 50 percent of all enrollees obtained jobs or joined our U. S. military services. In addition, 25 percent pursued further educational or vocational training.

From all over the world, many educational dignitaries visit your Job Corps centers so they can duplicate all or parts of the Job Corps miracle. Your centers provide a needed change of environment for youth who have dropped out of school and have less than average 6th grade reading and math skills. In addition to basic educational advancement, these students learn career skills and develop interpersonal techniques which allow them to succeed in the working world.

What is my reference point to make such a positive claim? As Chairman and President of the Management and Training Corporation (the Education and Training Division of Thiokol until December 1980), I am aware of our staff's contribution to the Job Corps story from its beginning in 1965. We presently operate six model Job Corps centers for the Department of Labor in Atlanta, Georgia; Albany, Georgia; Charleston, West Virginia; Shreveport, Louisiana; Reno, Nevada; and Clearfield, Utah. We have trained over 126,000 corpsmembers and it is conservatively estimated 80 percent of our corpsmembers have been placed on jobs, or into advanced education. Many have entered college or universities and received degrees. Some of our graduates are now operating their own businesses successfully.

Job Corps serves youth from every state, from rural and urban lifestyles, and from all different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Job Corps also serves hundreds of youth from Indochina and, from its beginning, has been international in scope. Of the 4,565 corpsmembers presently enrolled in the six MTC managed centers, 300 are Indochinese. Many corpsmembers, upon arrival, are illiterate or nonfunctional readers and need to acquire the social skills (communication, job responsibilities, work ethic, working with fellow employees, code of conduct) as well as vocational training and upgraded basic education levels.

Job Corps has always been operated on very detailed specifications. That specificity, coupled with ongoing DOL program management and yearly DOL program audits, has assured quality programs. Recently, DOL and Congress also initiated long overdue financial audits. If the results of all centers are like ours, the degree of questioned costs are less than one-half of one percent of contract value and final settlement will be substantially less.

The Job Corps program management by DOL is experiencing continuous erosion of the experienced DOL Regional and Washington staff. Over recent years, many experienced and highly technical program managers of Job Corps have been lost through bumping, riffing, and cuts. Job Corps is a most comprehensive program to operate and manage, and DOL management cannot afford the yearly losses of its trained staff. Every time you lose experienced Job Corps program management in wholesale lots you lose program audit capability, you open the door to unqualified bidders, and you most definitely lower the quality of the program.

Many domestic programs have been terminated or reduced because of shifting priorities at the National level. Many in Congress and in the Department of Labor have said that the Job Corps program has survived because of its high success rate and detailed accountability to prove its high return on taxpayers' investments. "This investment returns approximately 45 percent more than the cost to the taxpayers," as reported in the Evaluation of the Economic Impact, an extensive study conducted by Mathematica Policy Research. This being the case, the program actually makes money for the Government rather than costing. Summary highlights of this report are attached for your review.

Have Job Corps budgets remained adequate? No, they have not! Job Corps contract budgets have been constantly eroded or held at approximately the same level. Yet, medical costs, food, utilities, etc. have increased yearly. Every year contractors are asked to hold the line, give few merit raises, cut the materials, reduce costs, etc. This is proper up to a point, but that approach, year after year, is not economically feasible or sensible. Where can we as managers logically find ways to hold the quality of the program, yet take care of inflation without contract cost increases or minimal ones at best?

Job Corps vitally needs a long-range plan for upgrading facilities and equipment or Job Corps will no longer be as successful nor continue to be a national model for the world to duplicate. Despite the concentrated efforts of contractors to maintain your facilities, some Job Corps center facilities are alarmingly in need of repair and urgently need your attention to obtain an adequate budget level to operate efficiently. Poor facilities and equipment have a direct impact on negative incidents and adversely affect program results.

We have been advised by Department of Labor officials that Job Corps cost per slot for 12 months in FY '83 was $13,262. The current average length of stay is 7.8 months. Thus, the current average cost per each participating enrollee is $8,620. Is that a high cost? It is, in comparison to public school vocational education budgets per student. Ninety percent of the Job Corps enrollees are dropouts from public schools. They are economically disadvantaged and have failed to acquire minimal reading and math skills through the public school system. They certainly are not employable in the employment market of today for other than part-time or temporary work.

I believe that $8,620 is a realistic average cost for each participating student in Job Corps in FY '83. However, I believe it is an unrealistic cost for FY '84 or FY '85. For Job Corps students, there is no other alternative that provides all the necessary components they need to be able to enter the work force. The average cost target to train an adult under JTPA for this FY is $5,900. This training does not provide food, lodging, medical, dental, counseling, clothing, major educational rehab, etc., and for the most part provides only quick entry-level career training. The typical JTPA bid we have examined is for three to four months of preliminary skill training only. I believe that the JTPA cost targets are reasonable for adults with high school diplomas and previous work experience, but that the training time is not. An average training time of six months for JTPA enrollees is more realistic. Job Corps enrollees, 90 percent of which are high school dropouts and needing a change in living environments, certainly do not fit into most state JTPA programs and, thus, have limited rehabilitation alternatives.

For welfare recipients enrolled in Title II-A programs, the Labor Department proposed a job placement rate of 39 percent (Manpower Vocational Educational Weekly dated 5 January 1984); yet, Job Corps places 50 percent of all enrollees on a job or in the military, and 25 percent additional enrollees into further training or colleges.

Job Corps works because of all the various integrated components it offers, plus the necessary change of environment into a highly counseled residential setting. Typical youth training programs without the residential component find absenteeism of disastrous proportions. Deleterious community, home, or gang environments take their toll on skills achievement and attendance of typical dropout youth enrolled in non-residential training programs.

The California Youth Authority data (see attachment) clearly shows the need for change in environment for young adults coming from areas of delinquency, broken homes, etc. Of those youth incarcerated in California in 1982:

- Seventy-two percent came from neighborhoods with high or moderate delinquency,
- Fifty percent had one parent, brother, or sister who had a delinquent or criminal record,
- Forty-eight percent had undesirable peer influences.

Those statistics vividly show why high school dropouts from high delinquency areas and with undesirable peer influences should go to a residential Job Corps center which provides a change to a positive environment for learning.

Much emphasis has been given in recent months to reducing negative incidents. This is good. We should always, as operators of centers, make this a high priority. We have excellent student accountability systems, student incentive systems, and do abide by center and state laws. Students must learn to live and work in a framework of law and order before they can hold jobs and become responsible citizens. However, while we as a contractor do the best job possible to provide a safe environment conducive to learning, negative situations will occur. Every city, town, and school, including the Job Corps center, will always have a small percentage of the population which departs from what is right. Some students will not conform to rules no matter how excellent the motivational factors, the positive school environment, or how qualified or ample the staff.

Mr. Gordon Berlin, program officer of the Ford Foundation, recently stated at the National Governors' Association Conference on employment training policy that, "Forty percent of all unemployed are 16 to 24 years old. Youth unemployment is expected to rise, because the percentage of disadvantaged and minority youth is rising as a percent of the total population."

With our present millions of youth unemployed and "on the street," dare we fail to adequately fund the finest youth skills training and placement program in the United States? Dare we fail to retain our remaining DOL Job Corps experienced staff? And dare we fail to truly examine the quality and cost of the alternatives which include lifetime unemployment benefits and/or the tremendously high cost of incarceration? Incarceration costs for youth in California, for example, cost $21,000 to $24,000 per year.

In conclusion, thank you for this opportunity to address your Committee on Job Corps. Job Corps budgets and training slots should be expanded this year, not cut as they have been in recent years. Its success stories are real, are commonplace, and its failures are few. The Job Corps Charter is for skills training, job placement, and human development ...our unemployed youths' hope... and your investment in America's future.

Senator Hatch, you have repeatedly visited the Clearfield Job Corps Center and are aware of our success with your program. I welcome your Committee to visit any of the centers operated by MTC.

Thank you.

The **Chairman**. Thank you.

I just want to say to all of you that I have really looked into the Job Corps. Yes, there are faults; there are things that need to be straightened up; there are facilities that are inadequate. Some of them look like Holiday Inns and others like penitentiaries. I will not say anything more beyond that. The fact is we have to straighten them up. However, all of them do a pretty good job for these youth who otherwise do not have any help in society, do not have any opportunity at all.

I agree with you; I don't think that you have enough money to continue to upgrade and to do the job that you have to do to bring these kids into a marketplace in the eighties. We will see what we can do about some of those things.

I want to thank all of you for your comments here today about the Job Corps Program and S. 2111, the bill that we have filed.

Your presence here today will help to ensure that this committee recommends the proper improvements in the Job Corps Program. I think we will act more on an informed basis.

Bernie?

Mr. **Diamond**. Senator, you commented earlier and asked for the contractors to provide information on what they feel is needed for capital improvements.

The **Chairman**. That is correct.

Mr. **Diamond**. Within the past year all centers have been asked by the Department of Labor and the Job Corps office to submit their capital needs for improvements for both facilities and equipment. They should be able to give you those gross numbers.

The **Chairman**. We ought to have all 107 of them submit their capital needs to us, and let's take a look at it, because something clearly needs to be done. We have a successful program that really helps people who otherwise will be very unsuccessful, but with the program can become very successful, as Jerry here has become. He is certainly a major advisor to me. I really am proud of him and others whom I know about, such as the young woman at the airport, who had such poise and confidence. In fact, I have thought many times since, why didn't I say, "Why don't you come down to Washington and interview with us?" It was one of those quick meetings, and we were in a hurry, you know, but I wanted to stop. She was so proud to have graduated from the Job Corps. She was going to get a job come hell or high water; it was just that simple. I was really impressed with her.

Let me just ask a few questions of the entire panel. You are all aware there are substantial differences in the quality of the various local programs around the country. I have mentioned that some of them look like Holiday Inns while others resemble penitentiaries to a degree. Obviously, one of the challenges that this program faces is whether it can provide a quality service at each one of its locations.

Now as experts in the Job Corps field, what do you think really has caused this great disparity among the various facilities?

Bob.

Mr. **Marquardt**. I think there are some basic differences, first of all, in the original facilities that were provided. Some of us went into facilities that were really downtrod and with no capital money to fix them up, so they had a very late start in life. Others, luckily, went into facilities that were a little bit better.

I also think some organizations, which is my second point, emphasize quality more than others. I think they certainly approach the humanity of creating a home life atmosphere more at some centers than others. You do that by getting the students involved in a strong residential program, get them to participate and beautify the facility. If they beautify the facility and there are incentives provided for the beautification, and it is well planned and monitored, then the rapid deterioration stops.

I think some of us probably have been guilty over the years, not so much in recent years, of not stopping that rapid deterioration. You can put capital in, but if you do not have a system which prevents rapid deterioration, your centers will go downhill.

Student participation and changing the psychology of a center I think is really important. The use of surplus is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say surplus, you mean Government surplus?

Mr. MARQUARDT. Government surplus.

I have already mentioned earlier the need for a long-range capital plan and the follow-through and implementation of that. Hopefully, that is under way.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other comments?

Mr. Watkins?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, there were two ways of Job Corps Centers being established. The original—or I will refer to them as the older centers—occurred before the expansion which increased the number of centers to 105 or 106 today. The rehabilitation done on the newer centers was more complete and done to a better degree than the older centers. What you are seeing in some of the disparity is the difference between the older centers and the newer centers, and the amount of rehabilitation funds that were available.

The second point I would like to make is that the facilities across the country vary. You had old military, World War II-type barracks in some of the centers. You had newer type buildings exemplified by a former college that had been taken over. Accordingly, you see quite a bit of difference between the two.

The key to all of this, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is that there needs to be a long-term capital funding plan, because otherwise you are not going to be able to bring these centers—they will never look alike, but you want to bring them to the same level of adequacy. You need a capital funding program for this, and it needs to be on a long-term basis. The remarks made by Bob Marquardt were very appropriate.

I just want to emphasize one other thing. There is a tremendous amount of work going on in these centers to improve the centers done by the corpsmen in the construction trades. If everyone in this room could see some of the work that they have done in constructing buildings, in reconstructing buildings, you would be truly amazed. The cost of doing that has been significantly lower than it would have been if they had put those up for bid. There is a key to the best utilization of money to improve the facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

I have to leave to go to the Rules Committee. I am very grateful to have Senator Hawkins here, who will continue with some of the questions that both of us have on this particular program.

Let me just say, without objection, we will place the testimony of the National Football League Players Association into the record immediately following the last oral testimony. We appreciate the effort they have put forth to provide some testimony for us here today as well as the work that they do with regard to the Job Corps Centers.

If you will forgive me, I am going to have to run. I am grateful to Senator Hawkins for being here.

Thank you for your testimony. I really appreciate it at this hearing.

Senator **Hawkins** [acting chairperson]. I am pleased to chair the remainder of these hearings while Senator Hatch testifies before the Rules Committee on the committee budget for the Labor Committee for the rest of this year.

I am a strong supporter of the Job Corps Program. As you all know, we have three centers in Florida: Jacksonville, Gainesville, and a brand-new center in Miami. Like Senator Hatch, I am interested in ensuring that these Employment and Training Centers Programs under the Job Corps operate as efficiently and as effectively as is possible.

The question which I believe Senator Hatch was on was this: there are basically two kinds of facilities in the program, the Conservation Corps Centers and facilities run by private contractors such as yourselves. According to the documentation supplied by the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Agriculture, there is significant disparity between the cost of operating these two kinds of facilities. The Conservation Corps Centers are more costly on a per capita basis and handle fewer students.

In your opinion, what is the cause of this disparity?

Dr. Marquardt?

Mr. **Marquardt**. I will try it.

This is an area where we probably all are prejudiced because it does represent an area of additional work for us. However, to lay it straight, as I see it, I think smaller centers are more expensive. The biggest difference in the contracted centers and the Government smaller centers, the Conservation Centers, I believe is in wages and benefits, and a third area, which is a sleeper, and I do not think DOL is really looking at it, and that is the VST area. This is equipment dollars or rehab dollars that go with work projects.

The Conservation Centers get a stipend per student across the board. The contracted centers mostly have not even had VST dollars until recently, and only in the trade areas. I think there can be an equalization in that area which would really bring the cost down of the Conservation Centers.

Those are basically the three thoughts that I have.

Senator **Hawkins**. Does anyone else have a comment?

Mr. **Watkins**. Yes, Senator. I might add I have been associated in one assignment or another with the Job Corps since its inception. I have always thought that one of the strengths of the Job Corps was the balance. Programs were run by the Government, were run by private-for-profit contractors, and run by organizations not for profit. They made a great contribution through the years, and I think the balance has been a very significant thing.

However, we are in a situation of priorities. We have a little money to do the most good. I think it is significant that contractors will operate the centers because of their concern over unit cost and bidding at a lower cost. Therefore, more dollars will be available for the program.

However, I would hasten to add that there is a lot that has taken place at the Conservation Centers in the development of work projects that perhaps contributed, to a large degree, to the cost of those programs. That should be judged fairly.

In other outcomes of the program, I do not believe that the Conservation Centers have failed. We are talking about, can the job be done at a lower cost. The answer to that is, yes, if they are bid.

Senator HAWKINS. Do you believe it would help the program if the Conservation Corps Centers were replaced by programs run by private contractors?

Mr. WATKINS. It is a cost-effective answer that I have to give you. If we can give you the same quality job at a lower cost, the answer to that is yes.

I believe that the outcomes of the private contractors have been such that we could give you that assurance, and it simply comes down to getting the most for your buck.

Senator HAWKINS. That is what we are trying to do up here. It is very difficult.

What kind of residential support programs are available within the centers; that is drug and alcohol rehabilitation and English language proficiency instruction, et cetera? How do such programs differ among centers? Do any of you know?

Mr. SIMMONS. Senator Hawkins, I think practically every center I know of has drug and rehabilitation counselors that work with the enrollees that need it. I cannot answer about the differences among various centers, but I think practically all the contract centers have counselors that work with the enrollees who need this kind of support.

Senator HAWKINS. Does anybody know about the English language proficiency instruction?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is generally spelled out in the Request for Proposal, as to whether or not you would have other than English language. Minact does not have any centers that require that due to the section of the country in which we are located. However, I believe that the Department of Labor spells out that requirement, whether or not there is a requirement, in the Request for Proposal.

Senator HAWKINS. Are there any ways to improve recruitment of students in need of Job Corps training? Do any of you have any ideas how we could improve recruitment?

Miami has problems in recruitment. How do young people find out about the Job Corps Program? Do any of you know?

Mr. GAINES. I think that generally we have been able to keep all of our centers at the maximum capacity, depending on what the requirement of the Government is at that moment. By that, I mean if they are in a little bit of a budget squeeze, they say to us—"they" meaning the Department of Labor—"We would like to see your centers operate at 99-percent capacity," let's say, and the recruitment effort slides off a little bit and we are able to operate at 99 percent. Then they say, "Well, OK, now things are looking better. Let's operate at 102 percent." Lo and behold, the recruitment is accomplished and all of the centers are then operating at 102-percent capacity.

By all that, I am essentially saying that, other than an isolated incident here or there, I believe that—and I do not know, my companions here at the table might have some other thoughts, but it has been my experience and knowledge that we have not had trouble keeping the centers filled, depending on the budget requirements.

You came in a little bit late, but I am president of the Teledyne Economic Development Co. We have two centers in your fair State, one in Gainesville and one in Jacksonville. I know you have visited at least one, if not both of them.

If it was Gainesville—do you recall which one?

Senator HAWKINS. Gainesville.

Mr. GAINES. If it was Gainesville—that is the pretty one—there has been a lot of conversation about facilities. We were very fortunate in Gainesville. That is sort of the luck of the draw or the roll of the dice. What happened there was there were decisions made to put a center in the Gainesville area by DOL, a decision made that that would be a good place to put one. Lo and behold, they found a beautiful electronics plant that was down there sitting on 15 acres with pine trees and a nice green lawn and relatively new construction, and the company had moved out. The Government was able to buy it relatively cheaply and was able to reconstruct it and rehabilitate it for the purpose of a Job Corps center, and it is perfectly beautiful.

On the other hand, I am running one in Phoenix, which was an empty warehouse that was full of dead pigeons in 1969. I will never forget it. I came to that thing and said, "Oh, my God, can we ever make a Job Corps center out of it?" We did. That was the luck of the draw in 1969.

That is what all this disparity is when we talk about facilities looking like penitentiaries. Some of the larger centers—and Herb Watkins runs a very large one called the Earl C. Clements Center, which was an old Army camp back in the forties. You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. However, by the same token, it was the only thing that was of a size to train 2,800 enrollees.

You can go right across the river here to the Potomac Center. I walked through that at the time they were considering making that a Job Corps center, and I covered my eyes. As a matter of fact, I was walking along with Mr. Watkins and I said, "My God, what can they ever do with this thing? It's falling down."

Well, they did something with it. They kept propping it up. You would fix a ceiling and it would fall down again.

Then you go from the ridiculous, which that was— it was a very tough thing to do—and go to the sublime which is the center in your State. Every time I drive up in front—and you can see my name here, John Gaines—I say, "My God, there is the Gainesville Center. My Daddy would be proud of me." [Laughter.]

I am very proud of that center in your State.

Thank you.

Senator HAWKINS. We are, too, but I didn't know it was named after you. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. Senator, I might add that I believe there is a backlog of people, young people, waiting to get in Job Corps Centers across the country.

Second, I might point out that in the majority of our centers, and certainly in the center that John just mentioned, when we go at times to surge capacity, we seem to be able to do that relatively quickly. "Surge capacity" means over 100-percent capacity at the center. This indicates that there are people out there ready and wanting to get into the program.

Senator HAWKINS. How can the Job Corps Program do a better job of ensuring that the local centers are training students in skills that are in demand in the various local labor markets? Do you have any suggestions on that?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think that you are going to have to make surveys periodically to be sure that you are training to meet those skills. However, I want to be quick to point out that we get youngsters from all over the region in which the centers are located. I do not think you can tie it just to those local communities. It has to be a calculated thing as to the occupations for which you give training.

I do think that some study, some surveys, and some things need to be done to be sure we keep up to date.

Senator HAWKINS. Section 4 of S. 2111 contains suggestions for specific performance standards for the Job Corps Program, such as the number of enrollees earning certificates of graduation from high school or the GED [the general equivalency diploma]; the number of enrollees who pass the competency test in mathematics, reading, and composition; the number of enrollees who have entered employment in this field in which the enrollees receive training; and the number of enrollees who successfully enlist in the Armed Forces of the United States.

In your opinion, are these standards too restrictive or not comprehensive enough?

Dr. Marquardt.

Mr. MARQUARDT. On that one, I would say that they are too restrictive. I would like to skip back a minute to the question before: How can we do a better job in terms of staying up with the labor market?

I think each center, without any cost to the Government, can have an industry advisory committee to help tell us, from a broad spectrum, 50 to 100 members—union and industry—to tell us what are the trends.

The National Job Corps, at no cost to the Government, can also have a national industry advisory committee, which is long overdue.

We can also utilize national job survey information. It is available. A lot of us need to utilize it, including the DOL administrators.

More emphasis should be given in the RFP, the request for proposal, for a recommendation for alternate vocational areas that make more sense for that area and for the time.

Also, if you want to update to today's careers, you also have to update to today's equipment. It is very expensive. They have to look at the capital costs realistically and plan their budget accordingly.

Thank you.

Senator HAWKINS. A good addendum. Thank you.

Can the information be easily gathered on enrollment and termination of enrollment, in your opinion, about the standards?

Mr. WATKINS. Senator, the easiest information to obtain is at the time of enrollment. Often it is difficult, particularly when it is followup information dealing with placement, retention, or other aspects, to get that information back through the field, particularly where the center is being supplied by many States.

However, yes, to answer your question, it can be obtained.

I believe that it is important that these numbers, if you will, be kept to determine that you are, indeed, fulfilling the mission of the center.

I would like to point out that one thing that does worry me so often in the setting of performance standards is this: the Job Corps Program is so complex, it contributes so much to disadvantaged youth, that if you begin to emphasize some things over others, I would hate to see the neglect of those things perhaps not as easily quantifiable—neglected in the interest of merely serving to realize the performance standards. I guess what I am trying to say in a roundabout way is, please keep them judicious, simplistic, and readily quantifiable.

I would like to make one other comment, if I may, about the new skills reflecting the current needs of the marketplace. It ties in—and I want to underscore what Bob said—it ties in with the availability of equipment funds.

In many cases where we have surveyed and we have said, "There's a good job skill," we have had to answer the question, "Could we get the equipment necessary to teach this skill?" Some skills are capital-intensive.

Again, we come back to the real need for a good capital budget for equipment.

Senator HAWKINS. Most economists agree—that is a bad way to start a sentence. I have never seen economists agree on anything. Some economists agree that success in placement and upward mobility is tied, to a great extent, to the length of time in training. The average stay in a Job Corps Center is only about 3 to 4 months. Two years are permitted, with the possibility of an additional year of advanced career training beyond that.

Why do not more Job Corps students take full advantage of the Job Corps opportunity? How can this retention rate be improved?

Dr. Marquardt?

Mr. MARQUARDT. The average that I have talked about, have heard talked about by DOL administrators and certainly in our own case, is 7.8 average. The three, the four, or the five is in years past. The students, indeed, are taking more advantage of the program. Many are going into advanced programs.

Some of us occasionally have the problem—one of the goals of DOL is in the WTR area, retention. The higher the retention, if you keep the student longer, then perhaps you are doing a better job than your counterpart. We are scored on WTR.

I, myself, ethically feel that if a student is ready for the marketplace and he can gain an entry job, and he has the social skills to stay on the job, we should not institutionalize the students as long as there is a big backlog.

If we are going to be competitive with other programs, I think we do, indeed, have to look at the cost area. There is no question about it that some students take 2 years, which is a $26,000 investment. Some of them sail through. That is 2 years, 24 months. The average is 7.8 months or $8,600 per student. That is what it cost using last fiscal year's statistics.

A lot of students do come through with 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th grade—high school—abilities. They can make it in 3 months. However, I think the average is much lower than the sixth or seventh grade that the Job Corps talks about nationally. We have centers that are only averaging third grade coming in. Indeed, they need 2 years.

Again, it is sort of a regional response that each of us have to give almost to individual centers.

I believe, myself, that if they are ready, they should not be retained. They should be placed.

Senator HAWKINS. Any other comments?

Mr. WATKINS. I often find myself torn between whether really what we should be doing is making it possible for this kid to get out on the road to a productive life as soon as possible or whether we should try to place him a little higher on that road so he can go a little further. The difficulty here is that you have so many slots, you want to serve so many people. Perhaps if he is there too long, he is occupying a slot that we can give another youngster a chance. This is a sense of balance.

However, I would make this point, particularly in longer retention: we have seen it go to 7.8 months. That is today, with all the talk of high technology new jobs being created. I think we have to go further indepth in our training. This is a good thing.

Holding perhaps the youngsters a little longer to give them a little more solid base is, indeed, a good move.

Mr. MARQUARDT. It is the right trend.

Senator HAWKINS. I want to thank you for being with us today, as well as all the other witnesses who were here.

The committee is very interested in the Job Corps Program. It is very important to disadvantaged youth and undertrained youth. It is vital we maintain a constant oversight of the program to ensure that we are operating it efficiently and effectively.

We thank you for participating in this hearing.

[Statement of National Football League Players Association and additional material supplied for the record follows:]

NFLPA TESTIMONY FOR THE OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE JOB CORPS

The National Football League Players Association over the past few years has had the privilege and pleasure of working with the Job Corps. The NFLPA had over 500 athletes from every phase of sports, including professionals and Olympic medal winners, visit Job Corps Centers across the country to meet with the young people. Our task was to encourage these young adults to follow through with their committment to themselves and the Job Corps program, because Job Corps offered an opportunity for them to develop marketable skills and become productive citizens in our society. We encouraged the surrounding citizen and political leaders in those cities to develop a better understanding of Job Corps and what it was all about. Some communities looked at Job Corps Centers as a place for problem young people; we were able to change that attitude in a number of cities.

In addition the athletes voluntarily taped Public Service Announcements for radio and television. With the cooperation of Commissioner Pete Rozelle and the NFL, we were able to schedule the PSA's on prime time NFL football games. These spots featured such players as Franco Harris, Charlie Taylor, Ron Jaworski, from the NFL, and Tom and Dick Van Arsdale, from the NBA, just to name a few. The result was a record setting enrollment in the Job Corps program and a better understanding from the communities. The association of our athletes with the Job Corps was so tremendous that we had players who would go back to the centers on their own time and help out.

In the event a similar program should again be available we would not hesitate to get involved, because we feel these young adults are part of the lifeblood of our communities. With our ever-changing technical society it's important that we prepare our young people to deal with these changes, and the Job Corps is an excellent place to provide that base.

Gene Upshaw
Executive Director

Brig Owens
Assistant to the
Executive Director

(1) COMPARISON OF UNIT COSTS (COST/CMSY)
(2) Civilian Conservation Centers (CCC's) vs.
Contract Centers (by Center Size)
(3) Period Covered: FY 1982

	CONSERVATION CENTERS CAP: 135-250			CONTRACT CENTERS				
COST CATEGORIES	USDA COST/CMSY	USDI COST/CSMY	ALL CCC's COST/CSMY	CAP:135-250 COST/CSMY	CAP:251-399 COST/CSMY	CAP:400-599 COST/CSMY	CAP 600+ COST/CSMY	ALL CNTRC CNTRS COST/CSMY
Res Living	4,784	4,385	4,646	3,345	2,985	3,064	3,241	3,131
Education	924	952	934	690	598	657	602	622
Vocational Training	2,262	2,352	2,293	982	1,103	1,187	1,127	1,121
Medical & Dental	540	561	548	529	482	520	443	481
Admin. ("OPS")	1,979	1,848	1,934	1,776	1,834	2,082	1,093	1,914
Management	1,397	1,057	1,179	1,572	1,274	1,259	1,053	1,218
G and D	950	838	912	554	552	433	436	482
Fee	-0-	-0-	-0-	336	373	334	299	334
Income (minus)	- 112	- 46	- 89	- 32	- 24	- 39	- 55	- 40
CENTOPS SUBTOTAL	12,724	11,947	12,357	9,752	9,177	9,517	8,239	9,263
Cnst/Rehab	269	15	182	51	70	110	42	68
Equipment	77	79	78	225	73	100	60	89
Vehicles	26	152	70	68	52	43	51	51
VST	1,026	1,252	1,104	144	76	120	29	76
Facility Leases	-0-	-0-	-0-	108	144	201	99	139
CAPITAL SUBTOTAL	1,398	1,498	1,434	596	415	574	281	423
TOTAL (CENTOPS + CAPITAL)	14,122	13,445	13,791	10,348	9,592	10,091	8,520	9,686

Senator **Hawkins**. The committee will adjourn.

[Whereupon, at 11:17 a.m., the committee recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

○